

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

/1

by

JAG PARVESH CHANDRA, M.L.A.

FOREWORD

by

U. N. DHEBAR

President, Indian National Congress

METROPOLITAN BOOK COMPANY PRIVATE LTD.

1, FAIZ BAZAR, DELHI.

39.34
C-361.5.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published by B. V. Gupta for Metropolitan Book Company
Private Ltd. and printed by National Printing Works, Delhi.

**"We prefer to do things in
our own way."**

—Jawaharlal Nehru

Translation and publication of this book into all the thirteen Indian languages has been arranged.

Shortly, these editions will be in the market.

PANDIT GOVIND BALLABH PANT

**encouraged me in attempting
a work of this magnitude.**

**To him my labour is
DEDICATED.**

5595.

Sixteen other books by

JAG PARVESH CHANDRA

Teachings of Mahatma Gandhi
Jawaharlal Nehru and His Ideas
I Impeach Beverly Nichols
The Congress Case
India Steps Forward
Political Delhi : Its Wit and Humour
Meet The Heroes
Tagore and Gandhi Argue
The Good Life
The Unseen Power
Ethics of Fasting
Gita the Mother
Meet Col. Lakshmi
Gandhi Against Fascism
Is Grouping of Provinces Compulsory ?
The Pensive Mood.

FOREWORD

By

U. N. DHEBAR

President, Indian National Congress

IT is the aim of this book to give a comprehensive background of the conditions that led the country to accept the goal of Socialist Pattern of Society. The writer has, as will appear to any student going through this book not spared himself in collecting the material, and exercising mind in viewing the subject from diverse angles. In the course of his study he takes us into the history of the Avadi Resolution beginning from the Karachi Resolution of the Indian National Congress. I agree with him that the Avadi Resolution is a logical sequence of the various declarations made by the Congress since 1931. I am not quite clear whether there is any fundamental difference between the social aims and economic objectives of a Socialist Society and a Socialist State. I am not quite sure that a Socialist State can under no circumstances be democratic also. Nor am I sure that a Socialistic Society cannot be worked out under a totalitarian State. In my opinion the vital difference between the pattern of society India wants to evolve and that that may be obtainable at other places is that India does not forget "the man" for the matter. The development of the man is the primary objective that we aim at. Such development does need the development of material resources of the society, but we are convinced that such a development cannot be secured under a totalitarian State or a managerial revolution through State bureaucracy. This is the very vital difference. Every institution, whether it is catering to the political, social or economic needs of the society, will have to conform to this test. And so will the public sector and the private sector. We shall have to cease to think in terms of the traditional method of conducting our business. Soon we shall have to start thinking about the value we attach to the human being in each branch of our national activity. It cannot be done right away now because of obvious difficulties.

The writer of the book takes us through the history of capitalism and early socialism and discusses the different interpretations placed by different countries on the concept of socialism. He brings out that if we can create a necessary social background, the instrument of democracy is potent enough to reduce and ultimately eliminate the conflicting interests between classes and classes. The violence is therefore not an inescapable need of reducing or eliminating the element of class struggle.

I do not think that Socialist Pattern is a practical approximation of the ideal of a Sarvodaya Society, as the writer puts it. There

is an inherent and fundamental distinction between the two approaches. Both from the point of view of method and approach there is a vital difference between the two. But that does not mean that those who believe in Socialist Pattern of Society to-day do not believe in Sarvodaya. On the contrary, believing in Sarvodaya, they feel that having regard to the conditions obtaining in India at the present moment and their own limitations, it will be presumptuous for them to describe their objective in terms conveyed by that nobler expression.

It is a very interesting book from all accounts, and I am sure, it will provide great deal of food for thought to all those who are thinking about the socio-economic problems confronting this country and the new social objective we have set before ourselves. In a way, it will be helpful study of the subjects that are now being made to change the socio-economic structure of our country. We have a lot more to do to attain that level of clarity about the socio-economic objective that we have placed before the country. We can no longer be satisfied with mere generalities now. Clarity in detail presupposes clarity both in the theoretical field and in the field of application of that theory. The book, I have no doubt, will help towards gaining such clarity.

NEW DELHI :

May 16, 1956

THE ARGUMENT

*It is the growing and not the decaying forces of society,
which create the most disquieting problems.*

GRAHAM Wallas gave tongue to the heart beats of social dynamics when he wrote these very great words. It is these words of the savant of social sciences that furnish a key to the riddles which the Indian scene presents before those who are to-day knee-deep in problems at once baffling and enormous, with responsibilities for stewardship of multi-millions teeming the sub-continent.

Against the light and shades of this canvass, we find the silhouette of a decision taken by the Indian National Congress, at its Avadi Session in 1955, for reshaping the entire social fabric of India, so as to ensure equitable distribution of wealth, and provide equal opportunities to all for leading a fuller and richer life. This decision has been the subject of animated debate throughout the country. Not a day passes when the phrase "Socialistic Pattern of Society" is not referred to by leaders of Indian opinion, both in their public speeches and statements. And the national press has dedicated enough space towards its clarification. No doubt much has been said and written on various facets of the proposed socialist structure. Yet its manifold social aims and economic objectives have not been presented, systematized in the form of a treatise. In the absence of an authoritative exposition, even discerning persons have been interpreting the essentials of the new social scheme a bit too subjectively, either according to their preconceived notions or in conformity with their personal predilections.

It cannot be denied that subtle distinctions of terminology have helped more on the side of confusion than on the side of clarity, so far. For example, even the basic adjectives "socialistic" and "socialist" are to-day a matter of argument in regard to the quality and quantity of socialism that the two words connote. Again, terms like socialist society and socialist State; socialisation and nationalisation; State direction and social regimentation; State ownership and social control; economic planning and planned economy; social homogeneity and social uniformity, are often considered mutually inclusive and explanatory. It is also believed that an irreconcilable variance exists between the socialistic pattern as planned by the Congress and the Sarvodaya order as idealized by Gandhiji. Furthermore, the concept of a mixed economy is regarded by the critics as an unsavoury mixture of the public and the private sector, with the decentralized sector

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

shoved into it, so as to create further tensions in economic organisation. Along with that, it is also presumed that incompatibility is inherent in the voluntary and the State sectors, and that the advance of one means subsequential suppression of the other. Another conviction remains immutable in certain alarmed quarters that the propagation of egalitarian doctrines will intensify class consciousness. Such awareness historically being the precursor of social conflicts, the country, it is argued, will be rocked by violent upheavals.

A host of other instances can be cited to show the extent of terminological confusion that prevails in relation to the significance of words that stand as symbols of socialism, and the phrases that indicate gradation in the process of socialisation.

By and large, the reason for this divergence in the attributes ascribed to socialist terms is due to the fact that socialism itself being a loose social theory and a broad-based indeterminate humanist movement, dealing with almost all aspects of human problems, has no specific entity. In fact, the concept of socialism has been in a state of flux, for it has had no precise significance left. So much so that even its fundamentals have been interpreted in different ways by leading economists. Moreover, there are so many types of socialism dogmatized, that to own any particular form as best suited for a country's economy, is to become victim to blind loyalties. On that account, in all socialist or neo-socialist countries, the adoption and course of socialism has been manifestly dissimilar.

Another reason for the lack of adequate appreciation of Congress Socialism, as distinguished from other categories of socialism is that it aims at the establishment of a society whose pattern only is socialistic, instead of a society which is basically socialist, as ordained by orthodox socialist thinkers. Indeed, the key word "pattern" is the governing factor in determining the quantum of socialism to be grafted on Indian economy. Since a society of this kind exists nowhere in the world to guide as a precedent and inform our empiricism, misunderstandings or even misrepresentations of the real intentions of the Congress *vis-a-vis* the future social order should, therefore, cause little surprise.

Nonetheless, such a fluid state of affairs tends to create discord in social thought. This, in turn, retards the growth of emotional integration without which dynamism of spirit in pursuit of any programme for national reconstruction can hardly be possible. Truly, proper appraisal of the ideals aspired for, is an essential prerequisite of purposeful social action.

THE ARGUMENT

II

THE necessity of understanding the basic principles of Indian socialism, and the practicable means to be adopted in pursuance of those principles, is all the more imperative because the socialist pattern that we conceive of, is a harmonious blend of the many good qualities inherent in various economic "isms." Being pragmatic and not dogmatic in our attitude to all social problems, we try to find the middle course between the conflicting claims of diverse "isms," instead of running our wagon on the set rails of any particular variant of social philosophy. As such, individualistic doctrines based on natural rights, enunciated by classicists like Smith, Ricardo and Marshall, or totalitarian dogmas founded on the materialistic interpretation of history, propounded by dissenters like Marx, Engels and Lenin, can be of little value. Even the ethical egalitarianism of early Utopian socialists like Saint-Simon, Owen and More, or the human welfare concepts of economic Protestants like Sismondi, Muller and List, or the equalitarian tenets of Utilitarians like Bentham, Mill and Keynes, cannot be the loadstars to our public policies. To be precise, exclusive reliance on any social theory or economic creed is ruled out, for we prefer to do things, as Nehru puts it, in our own way. Such a disposition is nationally indispensable inasmuch as the problems that face us bear little resemblance to those of other countries, which have experimented with the socialisation of their economies. The peculiarity of Indian conditions being a hard fact, and the values and attitudes of the people, and their cultural heritage and historical traditions being of a distinctive pattern, blind-fold adherence to the postulates of economic determinism would do more harm than good. Further, our evaluation of the scheme of socialism being of an evolutionary, and not of a revolutionary character, and democracy being the instrument through which the gradual process of socialisation must reach consummation, faith in dialectical materialism, as a motive force which governs human history independently of human volitions, is sure to militate against the social objectives as laid down in the Directive Principles of State Policy. And so far as the Physiocrats' doctrine of *laissez-faire* is concerned, it is too late in the day to think of its resurrection.

Even though we have an understanding rather than a rigid doctrinaire approach to all social questions and quandaries, a dispassionate study of different economic systems is necessary, as it assists us in finding out the right solution to our problems which, admittedly, are of a baffling nature. In fact, so intricate are our problems that even the fixation of priorities and targets, and the allocation of resources and the laying down of programmes

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

within the framework of the National Plan, are vexing questions. No wonder, the planner in an under-developed economy has to go through the labour pains of a twins' birth in initiating development that ensures balanced social progress, and at the same time accelerates the all-round growth of human personality, as required by the dictates of democracy. Economic, as well non-economic welfare, has to be secured for the masses of the people because man being the measure of all things, he is the central point around which democratic planning enlivened by socialist direction of policies revolves. In truth, so great is the stress on the preservation of individual initiative and personal well-being, that mere economic advancement, at the cost of human values, is regarded as a wanting asset.

III

IN this work I have tried to deal with almost all aspects of the humanitarian-democratic social order we wish to establish. Nevertheless, some aspects might have been left out, as the task of reconstructing the present acquisitive society in which all manner of social disparities, economic inequalities and religious distinctions persist, on truly socialistic lines, is both perplexing and involved. For such omissions, I seek indulgence of those whose experience and knowledge of the subject, in fact and theory, is deeper than mine.

An objectively critical attitude to this book is invited, for I lay no tall claims to being a social thinker. But in all humility I do claim to know the impulses of my people, and the conditions of my country. In my own way, I have attempted to present an integrated picture of the new social organism as adumbrated by the Indian National Congress, the ideals correlated to it, and the methods in mind towards realizing them.

Towards the end, let me state that constructive suggestions from whichever quarter they emanate are welcome, as they will help in clarifying many features of Indian socialism, which to-day, owing to dearth of literature on the subject, remain obscure in some measure. Intellectual accord in respect of social purposes of a planned democratic economy will further activize the high adventure of rebuilding India on a just and equitable basis.

May this book help in bringing about a better and closer understanding of the refreshing and vital interpretation that Nehru is giving to the concept and principles of formal socialism. It is this interpretation that is producing a new social philosophy—a purposeful and dynamic synthesis of the best in every economic doctrine. So great is the significance, and so effective is the propelling force of Nehru's thought, that after a few decades the

THE ARGUMENT

discerning historian is likely to write: "Here was a man who showed to his countrymen the way out of the confusion created by the multitude of "isms," each crying hoarse for greater attention and stronger adherence."

J.P.C.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
---------	--	------

BOOK I

FOUNDATIONS AND THE FUTURE

One	Reactions and Response	1
Two	Socialist Society vs Socialist State	13
Three	Price of Private Profit	24
Four	Equity and Equality	31
Five	Doctrine of Determinism	40

BOOK II

INNATE IDEALS

Six	Star of Sarvodaya	51
Seven	Fraternity of Free Men	55
Eight	Stateless Society	60

BOOK III

PREMISES OF PLANNING

Nine	The Purpose of Planning	65
Ten	The Problem of Priorities	71
Eleven	Hope for Humanity	77
Twelve	Equilibrium in Economics	82
Thirteen	Fears without Facts	89
Fourteen	Setting New Standards	95
Fifteen	Demolition of Dogma	102
Sixteen	Democracy Beats Dictatorship	108

BOOK IV

DARKNESS TO DAYBREAK

Seventeen	India After Independence	112
Eighteen	Comparison Without Criticism	115
Nineteen	Danger to Democracy	120
Twenty	Figures that Frighten	126
Twenty-One	Production by the People	131
Twenty-Two	Live and Let Live	140

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

BOOK V

LAND IS LIFE

Twenty-Three	Land for the Landless	145
Twenty-Four	Collectivization Faces Crisis	153
Twenty-Five	Rural Rejuvenation	157
Twenty-Six	The Prince of Peace	164
Twenty-Seven	Real Revolution	167
Twenty-Eight	Ethical View of Economics	172

BOOK VI

FROM PLINTH TO PINNACLE

Twenty-Nine	Building from Below	179
Thirty	Dispersal of Democracy	187
Thirty-One	Partnership Ensures Prosperity	193
Thirty-Two	Obligations of Office	200
Thirty-Three	Manufacturing Misfits	208
Thirty-Four	Learning for Life	214
Thirty-Five	Democracy Demands Discipline	220
Thirty-Six	Inner Integration	226

CHAPTER ONE

REACTIONS AND RESPONSE

He who thinks, and thinks for himself, will always have a claim to thanks ; it is no matter whether it be right or wrong, so as it be explicit. If it is right, it will serve as a guide to direct : if wrong, as a beacon to warn.

—JEREMY BENTHAM

THOUGHT-CURRENTS released by the ideal of a socialistic pattern of society have been assailing the minds of men, irrespective of the stratum of society to which they belong. The intellectual stir created by the new objective has brought forth reactions which are both marked and diverse. Interpretations from different quarters indicate the variance in social thinking. This should not surprise anyone. Montaigne, the French philosopher, was right when he said : "There never was in the world two opinions alike, no more than two hairs, or two grains ; the most universal quality is diversity." The divergence of reactions to the socialistic pattern, from a broader perspective, can be grouped under six categories, in the main.

II

THE sworn enemies of the Congress openly condemn the Avadi Resolution as a hoax, a phrase without any substance and full of political opportunism. It is said that "it is just a catchy slogan, a vote-catching device, and a fraudulent design of the Congress to bamboozle the unwary electorate." The country, it is argued, has been bluffed into false values. The critics swear that since the Congress was losing ground among the masses, it had to come out with "a political stunt" to regain its lost prestige. Hence, it is concluded that this "much-trumpeted" slogan for the new social order is just a "passing-show"—lacking in sincerity and devoid of any determination. That being the evaluation of those who are radically opposed to the Congress, they want the innocent millions of India to beware of the "new ruse" of the ruling party.

These very critics, who ridicule the new socialist ideal, as an attempt to play with the electorate, had also labelled the First Five-Year Plan as "an election stunt." But the objectives of the First Plan have been more than fulfilled in most directions. The so-called "political stunt" has laid firm, the foundations for India's

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

economic progress.

For the benefit of our fire-spouting friends, it may be stated that the Congress, with its enormous historical prestige, is not such a stupid body as to place before the people a proposition in which it has no faith. If the great patriotic organisation starts indulging in such cheap tactics, its fair name would be sullied, and it would stand condemned, not only in India, but also in the eyes of the world. Maturity that age brings, and wisdom that experience endows, are the two assets of the Congress. The new ideal was adopted, not because some one had a brilliant idea, but after careful consideration, and with deep sense of social responsibility. That is why Vinobaji says : " Once a word has been used by such a great organisation, it is wrong to doubt its intentions."

On the other hand, there might be some logic in the criticism that the Congress always makes a fetish of understating its objectives, although its actual social targets are higher and more radical. The Avadi Resolution aims at revolutionising the entire social and economic life of the country, but there is no formal mention of the word "revolution." Grandiloquence has never been the failing of the Congress leaders. Nor making wild promises, in the wake of political agitators.

The sense of balance and propriety is so much developed in the Congress that in laying down programmes for social reconstruction, it has made no reference to the faults and failings of other political parties. Such practice of mutual political recriminations is common all the world over. But the Congress never thinks in terms of competing with other organisations through running them down. If it ever criticises, the criticism is addressed to itself, for not having moved fast and enough. Self-criticism has always been a call for further action.

Such being the mental make-up of the Congress, the Avadi Resolution must be considered as a sacred pledge for establishing a truly socialistic society. It is not just a fleeting idea but a philosophy of life which would regulate the conduct of the nation in time to come. This is logical, because the socialist ideal is not the ideal of any particular party, or section of society, but of India as a whole. In concrete terms, the concept of the socialist pattern conveys the firm and unbending determination of the Congress to reduce the income differential and disparities of wealth, and provide equal opportunities to all for a fuller and richer life.

III

HAIR-SPLITTING academicians even read a concealed motive in using the word "socialistic" and not "socialist" in defining the

REACTIONS AND RESPONSE

future pattern of society. The presumption that the word "socialist" stands for a greater amount of socialism than the word "socialistic" is without any basis. These two adjectives are interchangeable, for the content of socialism in both, in quality and quantity, is just the same. If this explanation is not considered satisfactory, then it may also be mentioned here that in the Economic Policy Resolution of the Congress, passed at the Avadi session, the word "socialist" and not "socialistic" has been used. Again, in the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan, the terms "socialistic" and "socialist" are freely used as synonyms in describing the structure of the new social order. No wonder, Disraeli, in the House of Commons, once remarked: "It is much easier to be critical than to be correct."

IV

THEORISTS, whose mind is beset by a rigid doctrinal outlook, maintain that the phrase socialistic pattern of society is too vague to create any popular enthusiasm, and too un-realistic to make any difference to the content of current programmes for economic reconstruction. Therefore, they want the Congress to discard its Utopian ambiguity, and define its objectives in clear-cut terms. It is argued that if everyone were left to interpret the significance of Indian socialism according to his predilections, or to draw on his own imagination, as to the shape the projected socialist pattern would take, these intellectual wanderings would create confusion in social thought. This state of affairs, the dogmatists warn, will hinder the smooth growth of social harmony—a prerequisite to orderly progress.

The term socialistic pattern, instead of the more common word socialism, has been deliberately used, as around the word socialism a cobweb of rigid theories has grown. And the Congress, because of peculiar Indian social conditions, did not want to run its wagon on the old track. The term socialistic pattern reflects, not so much Marxism to the letter, as the general spirit of social and economic justice, which has always provided inspiration to the national movement. The Congress is concerned, more with the solution of problems that face the country, than with blind adherence to orthodox political tenets and precise economic creeds. For that reason, Mr. U.N. Dhebar observes that "the phrase socialistic pattern of society is the theoretical expression of the practical problems we have to solve."

The critics seem to be oblivious of the fact, that the word socialism itself, is in a state of confusion. Its variations, indeed, are

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

baffling. Even the more specific word communism, has lost its original significance. In this context, the fourteen resolutions passed at Avadi, which provide a broad picture of the new socialistic society, have purged the looseness from the many variants of socialism itself. These resolutions are interlinked, and spotlight the integrated approach to new social purpose. All this has given a new and precise definition to the current and confusing definitions of socialism.

It is, of course, true that while the objective has been defined in concrete terms, and the main features of the new order stand out in clear perspective, many others have yet to be evolved to make the social and economic picture complete. For example, the problem of equality of opportunity for education has not been solved. The tough question of distribution of land to the landless still remains unsettled. The way workers could take part in management has not yet been found. The pattern of organisation for the socialised sector remains nebulous. Methods for bringing about reorientation in social attitudes have not been evolved. Reorganising the services and making them fit in with the needs of the new society still remains on the agenda of the unsolved.

These social items, important as they are, however, will develop as the pace of socialisation gathers momentum, and more experience in the practice of socialism is gained. Having decided for the "pattern" mere text books on socialism cannot be the only guide. What determines the "pattern" is the character of the actual social and economic problems to be faced. In fact, the problems themselves carve out the authentic path towards socialism. Short cuts and ready-made solutions may become hurdles rather than helpers, since an undue obsession to achieve quick results tends to defeat the objective itself. If these factors make the vision of socialism misty, then the charge of vagueness may have to be admitted. But in determining the pattern of human evolution, especially when related to social uplift and economic emancipation of 360 million people, pre-determined precision is not possible. Precision even in Marxian strategy is considered to be a kind of poverty. On that belief is based the dictum: "It is better to be vaguely right than precisely wrong."

Further, the social behaviour of so large and heterogeneous a mass of the people, with so much of diversity in social outlook, and economic standards cannot be foreseen with any calculus of accuracy. And the future of the new socialistic society depends largely on the measure of co-operation that the millions willingly extend to State effort because having opted for democracy, regimentation of social disciplines is ruled out of court. Considering all these things, Nehru has very appropriately said: "What the final picture of the new social order would be, it is difficult to say

REACTIONS AND RESPONSE

at this stage." The fixation of any time limit for reaching the new equalitarian goal is, therefore, not feasible, because evolutions being the sum total of aggregate social conduct, take their own time and course. The Liberal State, at best, can give them enlightened direction.

V

THERE are critics, who have nothing to say against the new socialist ideal, but they, on the other hand, accuse the Congress of having gone back on the famous Karachi Resolution, adopted in 1931. They maintain that this Resolution was so revolutionary that it had to be moderated at the Avadi Session in 1955.

Without going into detail on this point, it may be stated that the fundamental rights adopted at Karachi have been incorporated in the Indian Constitution, and all other principles and programmatic items are being given a concrete and definite shape, both at the legislative and administrative levels. In fact, the present labour policy of the Government is far more progressive than that enunciated in the Karachi Resolution. The only striking exceptions seem to be with regard to two items—number 9 and 10 of that resolution, which required that the military expenditure should be reduced by one-half of the existing scale, and that no servant of the State should receive more than Rs. 500 per month. It is obvious that both these demands have no practical validity in the present context. Of course, the top salary structure should be revised and a reasonable maximum fixed. As regards exempting uneconomic holdings from land tax, as enjoined by the Karachi Resolution, it may be mentioned that the current land policy is not to give relief to uneconomic holdings, but to eliminate them by making all agricultural holdings essentially economic. The question of providing relief to uneconomic holdings in 1931 had arisen, for at that time, radical land reforms, as now going on in the country, were not even envisaged.

VI

CAPITALISTS, who are overwhelmed by an intense desire to maintain the status quo in the social system, have expressed alarm at the unexpected decision to bring about a socialistic order of society. These reform-shy men deeply feel that the propagation of egalitarian doctrines, which are the essential concomitants of the new economic philosophy, will sow the seeds of social discontent. As a result of this, it is held that the country will be

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

rocked by a violent social upheaval. In holy horror, men lolling in the comforts of their vested interests, point to the terrible experiences that Russia and China went through, because of these socialistic ideas.

Apprehensions about this sudden change in the national objective are totally misplaced. The socialist ideal has always been implicit in the Congress ideology. As a matter of fact, Gandhism itself has provided a fertile soil for the growth of egalitarianism. The freedom struggle, although its targets were essentially political, and nearly all problems had political precedence, continued to imbibe the necessary social and economic content. Only it is difficult to trace with precision the exact origin of socialistic beliefs in terms of Gandhian values.

The Congress started with the "Co-operative Commonwealth" and has reached the "Socialist Pattern" via the "Welfare State." The stress and strain, inherent in the social and economic conditions, have been the compelling force in determining the future social pattern. In chronological order, the new milestone of Avadi, has been reached after covering four outstanding stages i.e.

1. The Non-co-operation Movement started in 1920.
2. Independence Resolution passed at the Lahore Congress Session in 1929.
3. The "Quit India" Movement launched in 1942.
4. The achievement of freedom in 1947, and the consolidation of freedom, thereafter.

In historical perspective, the Karachi Congress Resolution of 1931 can, however, be specified as the starting point of Congress socialism because for the first time a concrete social policy was laid down. It was stated therein that "in order to end the exploitation of the masses, political freedom must include real economic freedom of the starving millions." Further, the Congress Working Committee's Quit India Resolution of 1942, had declared that in free India, workers and peasants would come into their own and control the affairs of the State. The social pattern that the resolution envisaged was in some measure socialistic. The election manifesto issued by the Congress Working Committee in December 1945, gave a broad picture of socialised economy in independent India of the future.

However, the socialistic ideas which had been taking shape in the Congress mind were crystallized by Nehru, in his report of the Economic Programme Committee of the A.I.C.C., submitted to the Congress President in January 1948. Among other things, the report laid down that "our aim should be to evolve a political system, which will combine efficiency of administration with individual liberty and an economic structure which will yield maximum production without the operation of private monopolies and

REACTIONS AND RESPONSE

the concentration of wealth, and which will create a proper balance between urban and rural economies. Such a social structure can provide an alternative to the acquisitive economy of private capitalism, and the regimentation of a totalitarian State." The announcement of Industrial Policy in 1948, initiated the process of socialised ownership and control of different categories of industries. And later on, the basic principles of socialism received the imprimatur of State authority when the Constitution, with its Preamble, Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of State Policy, was adopted in November 1949. The Preamble emphasises the need for social justice. The Fundamental Rights create equivalence among rights of all citizens. The Directive Principles, which form the instrument of instructions, stress the urgency of bringing about social equality and providing equal opportunities to all, to restore economic stability. Indeed, these Directive Principles embody the essence of high concepts that the Congress has succeeded in discovering in its ceaseless pursuit of social justice.

All these declarations raised hopes among the masses, and as time rolled on, these hopes assumed the form of a sense of justice. It is evident that if basic justice is denied, social tensions increase. History of mankind holds the pointer, that unless sense of social injury is cured in time, society is rocked by conflicts and convulsions. That has been so because society hangs by the fabric of social justice. A popular Government can never exhaust the patience of the people, for that would result in civil disorder. "A populace never rebels," said Edmund Burke while speaking on American Taxation, "from passion for attack, but from impatience of suffering."

From these facts it is obvious that the adoption of the socialist ideal is in accord with the basic objectives of the Congress reiterated at different times. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Union Minister for Education, rightly asserts that "the Congress has not digressed from its old path, and that is the reason why the phrase 'socialistic pattern of society' and not 'socialism' as generally understood in the doctrinaire sense, has been deliberately included in the resolution."

It cannot be denied that the word socialism has an historical background and that blood has flown, heads have been broken and cut, and class struggles have been waged in the name of socialism. But, what the Congress aims at is the realisation of the basic principles of socialism by evolving a new programme suitable to national conditions. Capitalists, who in their nervousness, are trying to locate the Moscow brand in Congress socialism, are just being victims of panic and misunderstanding. The sooner they break the spell of this delusion, the better would it be for them

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

and the country. The advice given by the Prime Minister should be properly heeded by our industrialists. He said: "Do not be afraid of this phrase. By adopting this ideal and working for its fulfilment, you will serve the country and benefit yourself. But, you have to change your mental attitudes. It is good that they have changed and are changing, and no doubt will change."

Our socialism is, in fact, a gift of Gandhiji which he evolved in conformity with Indian traditions. Gandhiji was a socialist except in name. He had relinquished all his property, and lived like an ordinary man. That is why he would sometimes claim that he was a socialist. Once he said: "I have claimed that I was a socialist long before those I know in India had avowed their creed. But my socialism, was natural to me and not adopted from any books." He did not use the word "socialism" to define his own type of socialism, for that would have created unnecessary complications. He always emphasized that life should be judged by its usefulness to society. That test, indeed, symbolises the soul of socialism. He used to represent his socialistic beliefs in his own language and in his own way. This is how he described his concept of socialism: "Socialism is a beautiful word, and so far as I am aware, in socialism all the members of society are equal—none low, none high. In the individual body, nor are the soles of the feet low, because they touch the earth. Even as members of the individual body are equal, so are the members of society. This is socialism. In it the prince and the peasant, the wealthy and the poor, the employer and the employee, are all on the same level."

The capitalists, instead of complaining against egalitarian doctrines, should read the signs of times and adjust themselves to the new social climate. The days of acquisitive economy are over. The owning classes must realise that their wealth belongs to society because it is with social co-operation that it has been created. It must, therefore, be equitably distributed among the community. This new social concept of wealth is gaining so much ground that Mr. Andrew Carnegie, the American industrialist, in *The Gospel of Wealth*, asserts that "the man who dies rich, dies disgraced." The only way to avoid a bloody revolution is to share the riches with those who have none. The voluntary abdication of riches, and the power that wealth gives, must be accepted as a necessity for their own survival as citizens and for saving the country from violent social upheavals. The warning given by Steinbeck, in one of the most socially reflective novels of our times, *The Grapes of Wrath*, that "the line between hunger and anger is a thin line," should be properly listened to by the upper classes.

VII

BY and large, Gandhians are satisfied with the main social objectives of the new socialistic order. But some have fears that emphasis on the Western word socialism, will result in a sharp deviation from the Gandhian concept of an agrarian economy. Consequently, the ideal of village self-sufficiency, as the pivot of social structure, will be relegated to the background, as industrialisation increases. They further feel that with the emergence of a socialised economy under State planning, which necessarily involves some kind of centralisation, the Gandhian ideal of decentralisation to revitalise democracy, by broad-basing its functions, will never become a reality. In fact, they hold that State authority will tend to become authoritarian, as the Government enters more and more in the economic field for regulating the process of production and distribution.

As regards decentralisation, the Congress is not only committed to it but has been giving it a practical shape, both in the political and the economic spheres. The statutory revival of village panchayats, and making village the unit of National Planning, are but formal indicators of the vast process of decentralisation that is going on in the country. Indeed, the stress on dispersal of political and economic power is so great that conservative political thinkers and orthodox economists feel that decentralisation has almost become a mania with our planners. While the importance of the curtailment of State functions is fully recognised, it must be frankly stated, that if too much decentralisation stands in the way of efficient planning, or makes the State machine weak and incohesive, a check shall have to be applied on the policy of decentralisation. This is logical, as decentralisation is only a means to broaden the base of democracy, and to provide social content to economic progress. It is not a social god to be worshipped as an idol. Some middle way must be found, in which there is a good deal of decentralisation of authority, and yet the central authorities have strength enough to function adequately.

And so far as direct State intervention in economic life is concerned, it has become a social obligation because private enterprise has failed to promote social interests. Moreover, planning is an essential part of socialism. To be precise, socialism consists of 50 per cent planning and 50 per cent social justice. Of course, the control is to be exercised not with a view to developing State totalitarianism, but to making planning an instrument for social progress. Purposeful planning does not stifle individual initiative. Indeed, by harnessing it new dynamism gets added to social action. "There is nothing in conscious planning," Mrs. Barbara Wootton rightly emphasises, "which is inherently incompatible with freedom."

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

A happy and fruitful marriage between freedom and planning can be arranged."

However, the task of planners in a socialist pattern is beset with many difficulties ; to find a balance between State regulation and individual freedom, is no easy matter. This predicament is described by Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari, the Commerce Minister, as follows : " When there is a little more of freedom for the individual, the socialist will say, oh! Government is deviating from its goal. When the regulatory forces are tightened to speed up progress, the cry is, that we are proceeding towards a totalitarian State."

As to village self-sufficiency, it should not be forgotten that the scheme of community projects is rejuvenating the vast countryside and making villages economically self-reliant and socially happy. Therefore, it is clear that there is no divergence in the Gandhian and socialistic approach in solving the various social problems. If there is any difference, it is but a question of emphasis which itself is necessitated by the consciousness of bringing harmony between the ideal and reality. To avoid any controversy, let it be stated that the socialist pattern is a coherent blending of modern industrial socialism and the Gandhian concepts of agrarian socialism. This new blend brings the key to peace and plenty, and will make India the birth land of the highest type of social democracy in which free men may live in the fellowship of faith and fidelity. As Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee, the talented economist, has put it : "India is developing socialism as a scheme of society, as she is developing modern science and technology in order that she can live and thrive most successfully in the world economy, and can best contribute towards the enrichment of humanity by her own experiences."

VIII

WE have seen that different people have reacted to the new socialist philosophy in different ways. The variance in reactions is due to differing political ideologies and economic beliefs. But so far as the mass of the people is concerned, they have enthusiastically welcomed the new social policy. The socialist ideal makes the pulse of the masses beat stronger. This vital human reaction is logical, because ideas which are significant, exercise tremendous influence on the minds of men. Mark Twain, while discussing the social influence of appropriate words says : "A powerful agent is the right word. Whenever we come upon one of those intensely right words in a book, or a newspaper, the resulting effect is physical, as well as spiritual, and electrically prompt." Such being the motive power of ideas, the people feel that the adoption of an egalitarian objective is a vital expression of their inner wishes and a symbol of

REACTIONS AND RESPONSE

their aspirations. In it they see the fulfilment of their social urges which have been languishing in frustration. The common man to-day is more confident than diffident. It is because of this reason that new social forces have been set into motion which are reminiscent of the old days of the struggle when waves of enthusiasm used to sweep men and women into the fight for freedom. The socialist objective provides a motive force to millions to move forward in common endeavour, with a single social purpose. A new and dynamic spirit of nascent India, has thus been created. Of course, the pattern of activity is no longer of the old model. Formerly, the effort was restricted to the political plane, and in a sense was negative, as its aim was to drive out the alien rulers. But now the effort extends to the social and economic fields, and its content is positive, for it is directed towards rebuilding the present social system on a just and equitable basis. The high adventure, although so exhilarating and exciting, calls for a dedicated service of a less spectacular kind, than called for, in the days of freedom struggle.

The pledge to socialise the economy has created a new atmosphere inasmuch as it is in tune with the spirit of the age. The new objective is a new land-mark, a new stride taken to keep pace with the dynamics of the times. The stage has been set to consolidate the social and economic strength of the country. Suppressed humanity for a long time was thirsting for a new lead in socio-economic policies whose implementation could "wipe off the tear from every eye." That explains why the people's original faith in the Congress has revived and their interest rekindled with quickness, as if a magic word has reached their ear. The magic lies in the fact that the declaration to bring about an equalitarian social order, is not only right from the national point of view, but has been made at the right time.

An impression had been created in the country that the Congress being an old organisation, with its roots in past traditions, had become conservative and imbecile. The general presumption was that the string of successes that the organisation had the good fortune of achieving had made it complacent, and it simply wanted to pass its days in satisfaction that victory brings in its train. It was asserted that it had lost its old urge, and had become too soft for quick social action. But the "new and vital" turn it has taken, showing its determination to remove every kind of injustice in the social and economic life of the country, has made the people realise that a new stream of blood has run through the veins of age. Under the leadership of the Gandhian luminary, Mr. U.N. Dhebar, the Congress has recaptured its earlier glory. Now the country knows that all talk about senility and stagnation—the words usually associated with the Congress—has no meaning. To-day,

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

every one is convinced that the Congress, in spite of its age and traditions, possesses the elasticity to adapt itself to new values and attitudes. It is, indeed, a living, marching and a growing organisation.

CHAPTER TWO

SOCIALIST SOCIETY vs SOCIALIST STATE

We should have a great many fewer disputes in the world if words were taken for what they are, the signs of our ideas only, and not for things themselves.

—JOHN LOCKE: ON HUMAN UNDERSTANDING

THE national goal has been defined as the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society, as distinguished from a socialist State. Such a society has not so far been evolved in any part of the world. The socialist type of State exists in countries like Russia, China and Yugoslavia which pin their faith on Marxian socialism. Its prototype can also be found in some of the Eastern European countries which are under the Russian sphere of influence. The difference between a socialist society and a socialist State is fundamental, both in regard to political ideology and social philosophy. It is not just confined to laying down economic priorities, or determining the content of social security. To appreciate this dissimilarity, it is essential to know the distinction between a socialist society and a democratic society.

II

THE concept of a socialist society has developed from the concept of democracy, and the faith in democracy has grown from the belief in equality. Aristotle, in *Politics*, tells us that "democracy arose from men thinking that if they are equal in any respect, they are equal in all respects." Right from the earliest days of recorded human history, disparities in diverse forms and in varying degrees, have existed in all parts of the world. The institution of inequality, in its generality, was fostered, by the upper classes to preserve their special privileges and prerogatives. To insulate the minds of the less-privileged against the rigours of inequality, it was freely propagated that the prevalence of social unevenness was an act of divine dispensation. Even responsible Church leaders, John Bright, the 19th century English statesman, observed "had taught their people that slavery was a divine institution." The projection of such a view point had its desired effect. Men at the lowest rung, actually started believing, that their depressed social status was nothing

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

but a part of the social regulation constituted by Divine Law. Hence the existence of inequality was assumed as a moral certainty. It became such an accepted cannon of social environment that the very notion of equality was derided as the extravaganza of a social pervert. Such was the technique of the higher classes in maintaining their power. And power, as defined by Prof. R.H. Tawney, in his monograph on *Equality*, is the capacity of an individual, or group of individuals, to modify the conduct of other individuals, or groups, in the manner in which it is desired to do so.

But, as fears, prejudices and superstitions, under the impact of new social forces, loosened their hold on the minds of men, the theory of inequality lost its heavenly significance. A new consciousness ran through the mass of suppressed humanity that social disproportion was a man made instrument for the perpetuation of privileges. With the passage of time, this realisation grew into a strong faith that social maladjustments were not "acts of God" but the consequences of unjust institutions. All this led to the growth of a resentment among the less fortunate, that they had only duties to perform, and no rights to enjoy, which were concentrated at the top-most social stratum. Same sense of social injury was voiced by Richard Rumbold in 1685, when in his oration from the scaffold, he said: "I never could believe that Providence had sent a few men into the world, ready booted and spurred to ride, and millions ready saddled and bridled to be ridden." (Macaulay's *History of England*).

Thus, the institution of inequality, which was supposed to be spiritually ordained, came to be regarded as a grave moral breach. It is in such a social atmosphere that democracy came into the field to create an equivalence between rights and duties. Since concentration of political power in the hands of the upper classes was the source of social imbalance, democracy stood for political freedom to all citizens, irrespective of their position in social gradation. Another reason for giving the highest priority to political freedom, according to Kant, the 18th century German philosopher, "was the realisation that the faculty of freedom had the capacity to enlarge the usefulness of all other faculties." Freedom, which had been monopolised by the privileged few, was generalised by democracy. This meant that people themselves, by their own free will, should determine the form of Government, they wanted to have. The political base was broadened, because social awakening had become irresistible. Commenting on this new social phenomenon, John Stuart Mill, in *The Principles of Political Economy*, wrote: "The poor have come out of leading-strings, and cannot any longer be governed, or treated as mere children. To their own qualities must now be commended the care of their

destiny."

III

WITH the establishment of political equality, which by itself was at one time considered as a piece of Utopian figment, men's thoughts turned to the malady of economic inequalities which had deranged the social system. People realised, that although they had been granted political freedom, they did not have the freedom to secure even the basic necessities of life. The slogan, that both the rich and the poor had the "freedom to live in mansions," was spurned as a mischievous platitude. This negative freedom lost all its meaning and the demand for a higher type of positive freedom was heard. People refused to tolerate misery with equanimity. Since democracy alone had not the potentiality to remove economic disparities, the need for reorganising society, on socialistic lines, was felt. Social thinkers started believing that human society could be regulated and made to function on a rational and just basis. They further realised that economics played an important role in human life, and to ignore it, meant perpetuation of social injustice. The need for reorganising society also arose, because man being a social animal, wants to live in society, progress in society, and when the call comes, die in society.

Again, political freedom has three facets—freedom before law, freedom to have political opposition and freedom to have full democratic parliamentary Government. The first two types of political freedom could be maintained in the absence of economic freedom. "But for the proper functioning of parliamentary Government," Prof. Colin Clark, the Oxford University Economist, says, "economic freedom is an essential ingredient." It is for this reason that political democracy inevitably leads to economic democracy, as by itself it cannot satisfy people's aspirations. This social necessity forces democracy to accept the essence of socialism. Thus, a general notion of equality gave place to the concrete theory of democracy, and out of this theory arose the elevating philosophy of a socialist society. In fact, a socialistic society represents the highest phase of democracy. The reason being that while democracy remains content with the equalisation of rights and duties, a socialistic society aims at creating an identity between rights and duties. That is why in a truly socialist society, democracy reaches the supreme stage of ethical democracy.

The concept of equality, however, should not be interpreted as equality in ability. Democracy recognises the fact that all men do not possess a uniform measure of ability. It merely dispenses, as Plato put it, "a sort of equality to equals and unequals alike."

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

Elaborating this theme, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan, the philosopher Indian Vice-President, says, "democracy only provides that all men should have equal opportunities for the development of their unequal talents."

IV

DEMOCRACY being the inspiration of socialistic philosophy, a socialist society depends on the process of democracy to introduce socialism. A genuine socialist society has to be a full-fledged democratic society. Through moral persuasion and education of the masses, a proper psychological atmosphere is created for the acceptance of socialist ideas. In the implementation of every social policy and economic programme, the State depends on the initiative and willing co-operation of the people. This liberal approach to the process of socialisation gives the answer to the poser set by John Stuart Mill, about a century ago in his *Autobiography*, namely, "how to unite the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership, and an equal participation in the benefits of combined labour?"

The framework of democracy in a socialist society instead of remaining the monopoly of the State, is dispersed into small units of local self-government, which when properly established, become the eyes and ears of democracy. In this manner, political democracy and economic democracy march hand in hand to reach the socialist goal of "freedom from exploitation and individual freedom." Democratic ways broaden the base of socialism and its roots grow in the minds of men. Consequently, people become socialist-minded, and this fact helps in the establishment of a truly socialist society. Still, enthusiasts disparage such co-operative methods as dilatory and the doctrinaires deride them as vague and halting. Mr. Vernon Bartlett is on good grounds when he says, "liberal democracy is more cumbersome and, therefore, more slow moving than despotism." But this is only one side of the picture. The other side is provided by Mr. Harold Nicholson when he replies: "Democracy may be slow always and confused sometimes, but it is not given either to hysterics or megalomania, those two great emotional faults by which the angels fell." Democracy has stood the stress and strain over many long periods because it possessed the elasticity to adjust itself with changing circumstances. It might have brought many hardships and disappointments to the people. Nevertheless, the ultimate failures of dictatorship, cost humanity far more than any temporary failures of democracy.

On the other hand, in a socialist State, the entire thinking for the nation is done by a few men at the top, and their decisions

SOCIALIST SOCIETY VS SOCIALIST STATE

are imposed, in an arbitrary manner, on the people who have no other choice but to accept them. Democracy is condemned in unqualified terms, and individual initiative is censured as a spoke in the wheel of the State. For that reason, the price of this order is terribly high in terms of freedom. In fact, a socialist State believes that economic democracy can only be brought about if political democracy is extirpated first. Well-being is thus obtained at the sacrifice of freedom and individuality. It is forgotten that socialism, if achieved through force, and maintained by suppressive measures, becomes a source of repugnance to the finer spirit in men. All this has compelled Mr. Fenner Brockway to declare that "from the point of view of democratic socialism, it is important to prevent the expansion of communism which is not democratic." The advance of communism, which makes a special appeal to the under-developed but politically-awake countries, can only be forestalled by accepting the general principles of socialism. And as to the future of socialism, Mr. G.D.H. Cole, the respected theoretician of British socialism, maintains that it "depends on its becoming international, not indeed in the sense of a political ideology, militant or surreptitious, but in the clean and healthy sense of mobilizing the superior economic resources of advanced countries to raising productivity and the standard of living of the have-not economies."

A socialist society also aims at establishing real economic democracy. But it does so by preserving and strengthening political democracy. It is only in a socialist society that an individual can find true fulfilment. That is achieved by incorporating the equity principles of socialism with the vital tenets of individualism. Thus, a socialist society negatives the fear expressed in Hayek's *Road to Serfdom* and Lippman's *Good Society* that freedom under socialism is a contradiction in terms.

A socialist State aims at creating an "economic man." But a socialist society provides in a balanced way, both economic and non-economic welfare to the people, because "life does not end with food. It rather begins with food." Economics is recognised as the inevitable need of man but man is also regarded bigger than economics. To aspire for economic development, at the cost of human values, is to barricade the process of human evolution. The realisation of social objectives is the real and true national aim. Economic development is only a means, of course, a very important means for the achievement of social objectives. The Pigouian assumption, that total welfare moves in the same direction as economic welfare, is not the basis of our social philosophy.

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

V

IN a socialist society, the personality of the State, as far as possible, is kept in the background. But, in a socialist State, the State is glorified as the summum bonum of all social good, to be adored in silence and followed in submission. In a socialist society, so meticulous is the desire to relegate the entity of the State to the background, that even in the context of owning means of production and distribution, the words used are "social ownership" and not "State ownership." But, in a socialist State, the phrase "State ownership" is invariably used. This distinction by itself has a deep and vital significance because society, as a human institution, is given a higher status than the impersonal essence of the State. In a socialist State, both the State and the society, are regarded as interchangeable equivalents. Therefore, State effort is considered as the quintessence of social effort. But, in a socialist society, no such equation exists between the State and the society. The State is regarded as the benevolent guide and trusted friend of society. It depends upon social endeavour to reach the equalitarian goal. So much so that people who may be apprehensive, or even hostile, are asked to join the high adventure of social reconstruction. Thus, the approach to social problems becomes human and organic, and not merely, scientific and mechanistic. Such a liberal strategy creates a sense of function among the people which in turn provides new energy, new purpose and new faith to all social questions.

VI

IN a socialist State, Marxian socialism is regarded as the very last word on socialist thought. It is presumed that all the thinking that had to be done on the theory and practice of socialism began and ended with Marx. A myth of infallibility, therefore, surrounds the Marxian logic. In fact, it is believed that any rethinking on the subject is bound to create unnecessary confusion. That explains why its tenets are followed with clock-like precision and regularity. But it has been aptly pointed out that "even the most innocently romantic Marxist should surely realise, as he surveys the Russian scene, that there is still something more than to think about."

A socialist State, because of its blind adherence to Marxism, becomes the tool of socialism. But, in a socialist society, socialism itself is the tool, as only the general philosophy of socialism is accepted, which means providing equal opportunities to all with a view to ending all manner of inequalities. It does not get itself involved in the maze of any "ism." Such an approach is

SOCIALIST SOCIETY VS SOCIALIST STATE

logical because a country must be true to herself, and not to any alien dogma. This is the age of criticism and criticism is too strong for any dogma. In a country, where the spirit of inquiry provides inspiration to all social questions, dogmatism can make little appeal. On that account, Toynbee maintains that "academic doctrine is a diet for political exiles. They have to live on it as a medieval chameleon on air."

In a socialist society, the main features of all social systems are objectively scrutinized, and those which are wholesome from the national point of view, are readily accepted. In this respect, Nehru has frankly stated: "If anything communist is good, I am going to take it; if anything anti-communist is good, I am going to take it also. I can fit in just something from America, something from China and something from Soviet Russia." This pragmatic procedure, which our Prime Minister is adopting in solving the social and economic problems of modern India, has been recommended by our ancient philosophers. For instance, it is laid down in *The Mahabharata*:

*Good words, good deeds, and beautiful expressions
A wise man culls from every quarter
Even as a gleaner gathers ears of corn.*

It should also be remembered that the beneficial qualities of other 'isms' are not superimposed in their originality. They are first cultured in the peculiar social environment, and then grafted onto the Indian soil, so that the process of social evolution finds appropriate sustenance in our age-old traditions and cultural heritage. Emphasising the correctness of this methodology, the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad says: "If we have to escape repetition of the injustices and atrocities which produce all the conflicts of modern times, it is absolutely necessary for us to build the economic system on the foundation of the historic ethical consciousness of our country."

Socialism for us is not merely a social theory. It is, indeed, a way of life. It is for this reason that the word "pattern" has been used in the national objective. What India wants to achieve is not socialism, but a society whose pattern is socialistic. The difference is not just a matter of quibbling with words; it is both quantitative and qualitative. Words have great power. Things associated with them influence the thought process. Dogmatism is bound to creep in unless they are properly qualified to convey the intended meaning. The word "pattern", therefore, becomes the determinant of the new social order. The use of the term socialism would naturally have meant accepting all the tenets of formal socialism, and implementing its traditional methods in toto, to

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

achieve national objectives. Needless to say, India would have lost her rich personality by hitching herself to rigid dogmatism. Moreover, India's individuality is too strong to permit any social regimentation or precise standardisation of social behaviour. The concept of the socialist pattern is not just limited in terms of an economic palliative. Its main purpose is to integrate social democracy within the constitutional framework of political democracy. That is considered imperative because, as Mrs. Barbara Wooton, says in her recent book, *Social Foundation of Wage Policy*, "not only is social equality good in itself but the future of democracy also depends on the broadening of its foundations."

VII

THE new socialistic society which we wish to establish in India represents a happy synthesis of all the good features of capitalism, socialism and communism. It is, therefore, necessary to know the essentials of these social systems. The next three chapters are devoted to a critical examination of the various aspects of these "isms." The knowledge of these "isms" will help in appreciating the great depth in the ideal underlying the socialist pattern. In fact, the socialist pattern that we conceive of, contains a far richer content of socialism than is usually associated with dogmatic socialism. The significance of that ideal shines in the following high objectives which the socialistic pattern aims at realising. The list is only illustrative and not exhaustive because the concept of socialism, as applied to India, is yet in a stage of evolution.

It should not be forgotten that these high objectives cannot be achieved without laborious work, mental endurance and moral faith. The history of the last 150 years has to be revised, reconsidered and rewritten. Further, we have to accomplish within a period of 20 or 25 years what some countries took three or four generations to achieve. All this presents a mighty challenge. Mere parrot-like repetition of the word socialism will not take the country anywhere. Nor will a decree by the State bring about a socialist economy. Legislation helps but mass effort in the final analysis is the determining factor. The road to democratic socialism is long and arduous. It may even tax the people's patience. But perseverance in the present will ensure prosperity in the future. "No sweat, no socialism," is the watchword of the new humane-democratic social order. If ever the limbs tire, or the spirit weakens, we should remember the great call given by Mr. U. N. Dhebar that "a poor under-developed country like India has to make sacrifices if the socialist pattern is to come into being within a reasonable distance of time. People may

SOCIALIST SOCIETY VS SOCIALIST STATE

accept them as burdens or imposition, or the people may accept them as their willing contribution for the regeneration of the nation." The meaningful words of the Congress President remind one of the declaration made by Theodore Roosevelt, on his election to U.S. Presidentship that "I wish to preach not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of strenuous life."

VIII

THE following are the broad objectives of the socialist pattern :

In the *political field*, it guarantees political equality by

- (1) recognising the rule of law ;
- (2) maintaining one grade in citizenship ;
- (3) conferring fundamental rights and then jealously guarding them against infringement ;
- (4) granting universal adult suffrage ;
- (5) assuring that no disability attaches to any citizen by reason of his cast, creed or sex in respect of any public office ;
- (6) giving full freedom of speech and expression ;
- (7) accepting the right to organise different political parties owing allegiance to various political ideologies ;
- (8) investing the judiciary with the powers to superintend over the actions of the State authority ;
- (9) fostering full-fledged parliamentary system of government ; and
- (10) distributing political power at the State, the district and the village level.

In the *sphere of religion*, it ensures religious equality by

- (1) treating all religions alike, and making secularism the essential ingredient of the State character ;
- (2) permitting free profession and practice of every religion ;
- (3) showing no preference to any particular community to the exclusion of the rest ; and
- (4) safeguarding the interests of minorities, particularly protecting their culture and language, and thus instilling in them a sense of belonging.

In the *domain of economics*, it aims at bringing about economic equality by

- (1) owning or controlling principal means of production and distribution ;
- (2) regulating the conduct of organised industry, and

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

directing its production programme, to fall in line with the targets of the National Plan ;

- (3) protecting interests of the small producers and assisting them to form industrial co-operatives ;
- (4) preventing the growth of monopolies and cartels, and ensuring that capital does not concentrate in the hands of a particular class ;
- (5) reducing income differential and organising egalitarian distribution of national wealth so that distributive justice prevails ;
- (6) providing full employment to all able-bodied citizens on the basis of a decent living wage to increase their purchasing power ;
- (7) eliminating the element of exploitation, and assuring that the fruits of labour do not enrich the employer, but are shared by labour as well ;
- (8) recognising the right to follow any trade or calling ;
- (9) granting the right to peasants and workers to form unions to protect their interests ;
- (10) maintaining an appropriate balance between industry and agriculture and thus integrating the occupational pattern on a rational basis ;
- (11) activating the lowest social strata so that progress gathers countrywide momentum ;
- (12) giving topmost priority to the needs of the most backward areas and utterly neglected people, with a view to uplifting them to the common social level ; and
- (13) increasing production through maximum utilisation of natural resources.

On the *social plane*, it endeavours to create social equality by

- (1) giving the same privileges to women as are enjoyed by men ;
- (2) removing social disabilities generalised by class or caste considerations ;
- (3) recognising the dignity of manual labour ;
- (4) extending educational facilities on the widest possible scale ;
- (5) assuring equal opportunities to all in every walk of life ;
- (6) infusing a sense of human unity and common brotherhood among all persons ; and
- (7) creating an identity between rights and duties, and thereby, making people fulfil their social obligations for the good of the community.

SOCIALIST SOCIETY VS SOCIALIST STATE

At the *individual level*, it proposes to create new human beings by

- (1) raising moral values and cultural standards of the people ;
- (2) promoting full growth of human personality ; and
- (3) encouraging individual initiative.

IX

THE social significance and economic importance of the objectives of the proposed socialist pattern, enumerated above, and the methods to achieve them, will be studied in detail and dispassionately, in the chapters that follow. A close item-wise examination is not possible since the manifold aims of the new society are inter-linked. Although discussion proceeds on the basis of the main features and outstanding purposes of the egalitarian social system, as visualised by the Congress, effort, as far as possible, has been made to scrutinize every aspect so that the integrated socialistic picture stands out in clear perspective.

CHAPTER THREE

PRICE OF PRIVATE PROFIT

*The seed ye sow, another reaps ;
The wealth ye find, another keeps ;
The robe ye weave, another wears ;
The arms ye forge, another bears.*

—SHELLEY : SONG TO THE MEN OF ENGLAND

IT is very difficult to define capitalism in precise terms. Capitalism in its broad perspective has existed, in one form or the other, in different periods of history. The main features of capitalism can be traced in the Graeco-Roman sector of the ancient world. Its concept kept on developing with the change in the socio-economic conditions of various countries. But all the same certain characteristics unmistakably distinguish a capitalist society from other economic systems. Private initiative is the pivot of a capitalist order. Defining capitalism, *Encyclopaedia Britannica* says: "A society is called capitalist, if it entrusts its economic process to the guidance of the private businessman."

There are many forms of capitalism ; the most prominent being :

- (a) Financial Capitalism: Money lending for profit by charging interest ;
- (b) Commercial Capitalism: Buying and selling of wealth which has already been produced with a view to making profit ;
- (c) Industrial Capitalism: Production of wealth by employment of labour on wage basis and then selling it to earn profit.

Making of wealth being the common objective of all forms of capitalism, Alfred Marshal describes capital as "that part of wealth which is devoted to obtaining further wealth." The first two varieties of capitalism have an importance of their own. But it is the third type of capitalism, i.e., Industrial Capitalism, which is commonly referred to in all literature on capitalism and socialism. In fact, Industrial Capitalism, which is but one of the branches of the genus of capitalism, is treated as a synonym of capitalism itself. For our purpose too, the comprehensive term capitalism, will be used in the circumscribed sense of Industrial Capitalism. It is of interest to note that leading economists—right from Smith to Marshal who subscribed to the theory of a capitalist pattern of

PRICE OF PRIVATE PROFIT

production, and helped in making it a cohesive economic system refrained from using the traditional word capitalism.

II

THE industrial revolution of the mid-eighteenth and nineteenth centuries gave birth to capitalism. Before this, the world had passed through many stages—the nomadic, the pastoral, the agricultural, the feudal and the commercial. New inventions changed the form of productive mechanism, and huge machine industries were set up which bifurcated the population into two distinct classes. Under the new social dichotomy, the employer and the employee had different roles. Explaining the functions of the two classes, Engels wrote: "By bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists, owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labour. By proletariat, the class of modern wage-labourers who, not having the means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labour power in order to live."

In a technological sense, capitalism solved the problem of production. Even Karl Marx, the greatest opponent of free enterprise, recognised its contribution. In the famous *Communist Manifesto*, he stated that "the bourgeoisie during its rule of hardly one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than all preceding generations put together." Production was geared up because private individuals risked their capital, and showed initiative in experimenting with latest inventions, although their productive potential had not been fully established. The motive force behind this initiative and risk was the desire to get rich. In capitalism this urge to make profit has no social stigma. It enjoys so much sanctity that self-interest is presumed to be a constructive social urge. In fact, Spinoza, the Dutch philosopher, affirmed that "the primary and sole foundation of virtue, or of the proper conduct of life, is to seek our own profit." Therefore, profit motive is accepted as the central point of a capitalist pattern of society. It is strongly emphasised that if the element of personal profit is removed, production would collapse, as human activity would have no incentive. Defenders of private enterprise advocate a proper propulsion of this urge, so that social progress is adequately accelerated. Since personal profit is recognised as a worthy motive, the institution of private property becomes the mainstay of capitalism, so much so that individual ownership of property is supposed to provide social stability. It is also believed, as Mr. William James, the American philosopher, has said that "the instinct of ownership is fundamental in man's nature." Consequently, it is contended that to maintain

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

social equanimity, the State should extend protection to property as it does to human life.

These, in brief, can be described as the premises of capitalism. It is true that the profit motive has helped in industrialising under-developed economies. Nevertheless, the social consequences of classical capitalism have been depressing. This fact has been admitted even by leaders of capitalist countries. For instance, Franklin D. Roosevelt, in his Second Inaugural Address, said: "We have always known that heedless self-interest was bad morals; we know now that it is bad economics." As the new industrial system spread its sphere of influence, wealth began to fall in the hands of a few entrepreneurs. But the majority class of labourers, who actually sweated in producing wealth, remained poor. No heed was paid to the welfare of workers because greed for more profit ruled the mind of the employer. Prosperity at the top increased. Yet, social unhappiness grew in volume. Unconscionable disparities in wealth and incomes gave rise to class conflicts. Private enterprise, instead of being an instrument of social stability, as claimed by the advocates of capitalism, became an agent of social disequilibrium. Lenin was not wrong when he remarked: "Capital, created by labour of the worker, oppresses the worker by undermining the small proprietor, and creating an army of the unemployed." These, in a nutshell, are the effects of capitalism, in relationship to the employer and the employee.

III

LET us now examine the position of the consumer in a capitalist economy. As production is planned not for social consumption but with a view to maximising profits, the felt needs of the consumer have very little say in determining the pattern of production. Decisions regarding what to produce, how much to produce, when to produce, and for what type of consumer to produce, are all taken by the industrialists themselves, whose eyes are always glued to profit charts. If a textile magnate finds that production of superfine silk will yield him large dividends, because the privileged classes are willing to purchase this item of luxury, he will manufacture it, without caring for the common folk, who may be urgently needing cheap coarse cloth for their daily use. That is why the nation's resources are generally utilised not to satisfy actual needs of the people, but to amass personal profits. Any service that is rendered to the people is incidental. In other words, in a capitalist economy, the community as such, does not fully benefit from the increased production of wealth.

It is claimed that although the wishes of the general consumer

PRICE OF PRIVATE PROFIT

exercise little influence over production plans, in matters of consumption, the consumer is the sovereign. The reason being that he can decline to purchase goods, if they are priced too high. This factor tends to keep prices down at a reasonable level. In consequence, the producer's design to bag maximum profits is frustrated. According to classical economists, personal preferences of consumers stabilize prices, and free market in a great measure checks the growth of individual acquisitiveness, with which private enterprise is associated.

All this sounds plausible. It cannot be denied that competition, in the early stages of capitalism, did give some power to the consumer to regulate the price structure. But capitalists, in order to overcome the free play of competition, which acts as a deterrent to profit maximisation, start forming industrial combinations. Since in the words of Prof. Ely, "competition is wasteful," these combines by eliminating competition avoid waste, and increase their profits. The necessity of organising different units of production under a single management also arises from the fact that working in isolation, and in ignorance of each other, they head towards over-production, which apart from its other ill-effects, reduces the margin of profit. Business combines give monopolistic power to the producer. The consumer, therefore, becomes a mere pawn in the sinister game of exploitation and he accepts the dictates of big producers with a spirit of resignation. No wonder, August Bebel, the noted German socialist leader, went to the extent of saying that "the nature of business is swindling."

Cartels, as they gain more economic power, start casting their pernicious shadows over small business concerns. Mr. T.K. Quinn, the American industrialist, in his book *Giant Business: Threat to Democracy*, writes: "They are pressed into submission by the monopolies through methods which are irregular, if not immoral." Either the small units of production merge themselves into huge combines, or work in utter subservience to them. Thus, free enterprise itself, in a free economy receives a setback. The myth of unlimited opportunities for the small entrepreneur has been exploded by Mr. Quinn when he portrays the picture of capitalism in America. According to him, three-fourths of the country's assets are controlled by one per cent of the companies. Further, these companies, though so few in number, produce nearly half of the industrial goods, and their share of profit rises in the neighbourhood of 60 per cent. Since monopolies are formed to eliminate competition, they follow restrictionist policies in matters of production to maintain oppressive prices. And if production, which is usually planned on the basis of an impersonal prediction of wants, exceeds anticipated consumption, the extra goods are destroyed to bolster up prices. Describing the

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

ignoble social effects of the greed to maximise profits by putting artificial restrictions on production, Steinbeck, in *The Grapes of Wrath*, wrote: "The fields were fruitful and starving men moved on the roads. The granaries were full and the children of the poor grew up rachitic, and the pustules of pellagra swelled on their side. Children dying of pellagra must die, because profit cannot be taken from an orange. And coroners must fill in certificates—died of malnutrition—because the food must rot, must be forced to rot." Thus, restrictionism and interventionism act as a barricade to social progress.

The evils of monopolization are not confined to the economic field only ; huge economic power enables the "economic royalists" to wield political power as well. It is a hard reality that if the State does not own, or at least control these massive sources of industrial production, the State itself tends to be controlled by "kings of industry." Even in the early nineteenth century, when capitalism was just gathering momentum, the political influence of big industrialists had become a strong factor. Mr. John C. Calhoun, the well-known American statesman, warning his country of this menace, said in 1836: "A power has risen up in the Government, greater than the people themselves, consisting of many and various powerful interests, combined into one mass, and held together by the cohesive power of the vast surplus in the banks." To avoid such concentration of economic power in the hands of a few, the Avadi Resolution called upon the Government to take steps for the "prevention of private trusts and cartels." Not only does their existence militate against the proper functioning of the economic system, but it also endangers the very existence of democracy itself. Such a danger exists even in advanced democracies because economic power is co-related with political power. As a matter of fact, the favoured few of finance have always been making use of State authority to oppress the disfavoured. Goldsmith had sensed this in *The Traveller* when he wrote, "laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law."

IV

CAPITALISM in olden days was acclaimed as the saviour of mankind because by modernising production it increased national wealth. It also made country after country centres of industry, commerce and finance. In fact, it gave a new shape to Western civilization itself. To-day it is under disgrace inasmuch as it has developed intolerable wrong tendencies. It is no longer regarded as the god of society. Capitalism in the international field breeds conflict and colonialism, for it must have foreign markets to dump surplus

goods. At home it stands in the way of total mobilization of natural resources for the promotion of general public good. Moreover, in the context of present social aspirations and economic conditions, capitalism has outlived its usefulness. But capitalism is not the only system in the world which had to face decadence. Life has never been static. Economic systems spring from the dynamics of life and are evolved to meet the prevailing needs and requirements of a community. As society advances, social philosophy changes, accordingly. It is wrong to presume that whatever exists to-day represents the final phase of human thought. "No idea is so antiquated," Mr. Ellen Glasgow rightly observes, "that it was not once modern. No idea is so modern that it will not some day be antiquated." Social systems are meant for man, and not man for any system. Analysing the role played by various systems in different periods of history, the Prime Minister says: "Systems—economic and political—have their day and do good in their day, and then they become rather out of date. The feudal system, undoubtedly, was good in its time and served the purpose of society at its time. It ceased to be good, later. Society outgrew it and went on to some other system. So the capitalist system, with all its vices and virtues, fulfilled a certain purpose at a time in the history of the world. But that period is over, almost over, and one has to go to the next step."

It is true that capitalism flourishes in America and its economic philosophy and potential throws a challenge to the very concept of socialism. But its success is not due to its intrinsic merits or social purpose; special circumstances have helped capitalism to achieve great heights. Even there, capitalism in its original form, as the paradise of small entrepreneur, no longer exists. Big business holds the reigns of the economic structure. On this subject, Mr. Reinhold Niebuhr, the distinguished American economist, says: "Concentration, not competition, characterises the American economy of to-day. The typical American industry consists of a few large firms responsible for most of the output, and a number of small ones accounting for the rest."

Although capitalism has reached the stage of stagnation, it is not as yet a dead force in stepping up production. What is needed is an effective control over its activities and a proper remedy for the defects, blemishes and evils that have arisen in private enterprise. Scrapping the entire system because it has developed certain unsocial tendencies will hardly be an act of wisdom. Proper direction should be given to the engine of production. And distribution should be regulated to subserve social interests. There is a lot of truth in Woodrow Wilson's remark that the way to stop financial "joy-riding" is to arrest the chauffeur, not the automobile.

The attitude that capitalism being an outmoded system will

perish because of its own contradictions is hardly realistic. Such a view point was strongly advocated by Marx. In *The Capital* he wrote : "Capitalist production begets, with the inexorability of a law of nature, its own negation." Many socialist thinkers, in spite of the fact that they do not fully subscribe to the Marxian interpretation of economic determinism, believe that capitalism will die of the inherent process of self-destruction. Discussing the rise and fall of capitalism, the celebrated thinker, Prof. Haldane says : "Capitalism did not arise because capitalists stole the land or the workmen's tools, but because it was more efficient than feudalism. It will perish because it is not merely less efficient than socialism, but actually self-destructive."

It is also not proper to keep on abusing capitalists, for they are rich, or praising a section of society simply because it is in penury. Poverty is not something to be praised; to do that is to glorify something that is essentially inhuman. Means must be found to eradicate it. Like any other system capitalism has its own faults and failings. No one denies that its vices are more than its virtues. Political sagacity lies in removing its vices and utilising its virtues. Even, Prof. Hartley Withers, who is regarded as one of the powerful champions of capitalism, after recounting the contributions it made in the past, states : "But when we have taken off our hats to them, we have to give our minds to reforming and improving the capitalism of the present."

CHAPTER FOUR

EQUITY AND EQUALITY

There is much to support the belief that there is a struggle for existence among ideas, and that those tend to prevail which correspond with the changing needs of humanity.

—W. R. INGE: OUTSPOKEN ESSAYS

THE origin and development of the socialistic thought can be traced back to the earliest days of recorded human history. Socialism in its broader perspective, has never been the monopoly of any particular social system, because its elemental aim has been the removal of various types of injustices from which man suffered during different periods of history. That is why it has been a natural phase in the evolution of society. Socialism became a necessity, whenever and in whatever country, the less-privileged felt that the bolts of social tyranny, or economic exploitation, were tightened beyond human endurance. The abolition of slave trade, the scrapping of the graded system of citizenship, the emancipation of women from the overlordship of the superior sex, the ban on the use of child labour, the freedom of nations from the shackles of foreign imperialism, the broad-basing of democracy, the provision of educational facilities, the extension of the scope of employment opportunities, the care of the physically disabled, and finally, the process of ensuring social justice to the wage-earner—are the various and gradual stages, and external manifestations of socialistic thought.

II

IN its historical context, socialism had its earliest exponents in Plato and Thomas More. Plato's *Republic* and More's *Utopia*, emphasised the urgency of evolving a social system based on human unity and moral justice. The writings of Amos, Hosea and Isaiah also contained an element of socialism. Literature by Utopian thinkers can, in a way, be regarded as anticipations of modern socialism. The socialist thought of earlier days, being essentially idealist in character, enjoyed the free support of men like Saint Simon, Fourier and Robert Owen. The different facets of socialistic ideology became more pronounced as social relationship, under the stress and strain of the struggle for existence, became

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

more complex. And later on, the desire for better living conditions, which was generated by the growth of social consciousness, added fresh ideas to the old socialistic philosophy. In short, the content and form of socialistic beliefs was moulded by the varying social, political and economic conditions that obtained in different regions and at different times. But it was Karl Marx, the greatest of all dissenters, who through his original, though much exaggerated, assessment of human urges and predeterministic interpretation of economic forces, gave socialism a new and dynamic significance. He codified the entire process of socialism into set laws and rigid dogmas, and called it communism. Scientific socialism of Karl Marx was distinctively different from the "Utopianism" of his predecessors. Thus over a vast expanse of human history, a vague idea developed into a definite ideal; an abstruse theory based on ethical considerations became a body of well-defined economic doctrines for achieving definite social objectives, and a conceptual movement whose strategy for social action was, more or less, a matter of chance or mere guess work, was made the regulator of specific programmes and concrete methods, having precise social purpose to provide the motive force for quick social progress. Socialism at the hands of Karl Marx acquired a new meaning because the static feudalistic economy of Europe, under the impact of the great Industrial Revolution, had undergone radical changes. Capitalism split humanity into two distinct social worlds. Describing the social consequences of the new civilization ushered in by capitalism, Thomas Paine, the 18th century political and theological writer, stated that "it had operated two ways to make one part of society more affluent and the other part more wretched, than would have been the lot of either in a natural state." The whole social fabric was so much affected by the mechanised methods of production that unexpected social problems came into being, and both individually and collectively, they cried for solution. Modern socialism, in short, emerged out of the crucible of social sufferings created by the capitalist apparatus. Starting as a remedial measure against the social evils let loose by uncontrolled industrialism, socialism grew into a fighting counterblast to capitalism itself. A socialist economy being an anti-thesis to a capitalist economy, without modern capitalism there would have been no modern socialism. The real purpose of socialism was to bring about social equivalence and eliminate all manner of special privileges and prerogatives created by a capitalist pattern of society. By removing individual acquisitiveness, it sought to promote social good. It became a constructive social force working in the larger interests of the mass of the people. Wilhelm Liebknecht, the German socialist leader, rightly says: "Socialism is not at all the enemy of civilization. It only wants to extend civilization to all humanity;

EQUITY AND EQUALITY

under capitalism, civilization is the monopoly of a privileged minority."

III

ALTHOUGH Karl Marx put new life and fresh blood into the skeleton of socialism, and clothed it with well-tailored doctrines—and the vigour of its kicks was felt in every part of the world—yet the old brands of socialism continued to have their own importance. In fact, some new varieties kept on appearing. Each type claimed its own adherents. What is worth noting is that people belonging to the same social stratum, and having more or less common economic problems, gave equal loyalties to different schools of socialism. And, so diverse was the pattern of various socialistic systems that in some cases, their very basic postulates, were laden with conflicting economic ideologies and their social purpose consequently was dissimilar in character. For instance, Hitler's Fascism, which masqueraded under the pleasing phrase of National Socialism, was in reality the sworn enemy of all the good inherent in socialism. The word socialism was retained in the national objective to win the confidence of the working class. Little did labour know, when it called Hitler, the Saviour of Germany, that in time to come, it would become a slave of giant capitalism, and a mere automaton in the centralised State machinery. National Socialism was so much opposed to socialism, that it even rejected secularism which is the essential prerequisite of modern socialist philosophy. The persecution of Jews on racial considerations was the very negation of socialism, for, socialism never permits the dominance of one religious sect over another. Lenin had also expressed his hostility to the Jews. But that was not on any racial grounds. This is clear when he said in 1918: "The Jewish bourgeoisie are our enemies, not as Jews, but as bourgeoisie. The Jewish worker is our brother." The ruthless manner in which the socialist slogan was exploited in Hitlerite Germany to establish a Fascist regime, unmistakably proves that experiments with socialism can take serious turns unless its fundamentals are accepted without any mental reservation.

Literature on socialism is already vast and is expanding. This is logical, because socialism is not only a dominant factor in the world of to-day, but is going to be the social philosophy of tomorrow, as is evident from the prevailing social trends. Yet, its definitions are equally vast in number. No two definitions are exactly similar; every author has his own way of defining it. The following three examples show the variance in the connotation of socialism. John Stuart Mill, in *The Principles of Political*

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

Economy, says: "What is characteristic of socialism is the joint ownership by all members of the community of the instruments and means of production, which carries with it the consequence, that the division of all the produce among the body of owners must be a public act performed according to the rules laid down by the community." In *Socialism and Social Reform*, Prof. Richard T. Ely, writes: "Socialism is that contemplated system of industrial society which proposes the abolition of private property in the great material instruments of production, and the substitution therefor of collective property; and advocates the collective management of production, together with the distribution of social income by society and private property, in the larger proportion of this social income." Having seen the definitions of socialism by two distinguished economists, let us hear what the celebrated dramatist, George Bernard Shaw, has to say on socialism. According to him, "socialism, reduced to its simplest legal and practical expression, means the complete discarding of the institution of private property by transforming it into public property, and the division of the resultant public income equally and indiscriminately among the entire population. In socialism, private property is anathema and equal distribution of income the first consideration."

Whatever may be the divergence in the description of the socialist philosophy, socialism as generally understood, is a theory and a movement aiming at the collective organisation of the community, in the larger interests of the common man, through common ownership and collective control of the means of production and distribution. A society based on such an economic system caters to the maximum welfare of the people. While socialism promotes the largest social good, equality of incomes is not necessarily implied in it. It aims at doing away with dangerous disparities in fortunes, and providing equal opportunities to all, so that a common level in social progress is assured. And, as Dr. Rainer Schickel of the United Nations, has said: "The theory of income distribution most applicable to the dominant social values of modern society does not posit equal per capita income as a goal, but an adequate minimum income floor below which people should not fall." This concept of "an adequate minimum income floor" was best explained by Mahatma Gandhi when he declared: "Economic equality of my conception does not mean that everyone would literally have the same amount. It simply means that everybody should have enough for his, or her needs. The elephant needs thousand times more food than the ant, but that is not an indication of inequality. So the real meaning of economic equality is: 'To each according to his need.' That was the definition of Marx. If a single man demanded as much as a man with wife and four children, that would be a violation

EQUITY AND EQUALITY

of economic equality.”

Different countries have adapted socialism in the light of their peculiar conditions. Again, different political parties in the same country, have interpreted its principles with a view to making them fit into the broad framework of their political ideology. The political atmosphere of our own country is illustrative of this fact. The Congress, the Praja Socialists and the Communists all call themselves socialists. But the actual content of socialism remains different for all these political organisations. From the standpoint of democracy, it would be highly desirable that there is a better appreciation among leading parties of the transcendental imperatives of the new social system, because in the words of Prof. G.D.H. Cole, “it is essential to the working of the party system that the rival parties which dominate the situation agree on fundamentals.” It seems that the words uttered by Sir William Harcourt, more than half a century ago, that “we are all socialists now,” apply remarkably well to the India of 1956. One gets the impression that the whole country is set on a common social aim, and all have become “sociates”—comrades in the real sense. In fact, there seems to be a general fight for more socialism. Economic writers have also developed a soft corner for socialist ideology. Marshall’s remark in 1907 that “every economist of the present generation is a socialist,” holds good in a large measure in the case of Indian economists.

IV

THE word socialism, as such, comes from the West, and was for the first time used in 1827. It generally stood for bettering the conditions of the working class through remedial State legislation, such as Factory Acts and insurance against sickness and old age. In 1872, the term “socialism of the chair” was coined to ridicule the above doctrines enunciated by some economists in Germany. Being a general term, its variants since then, have been many. Mr. Alexander Grey in his book *The Socialist Tradition from Moses to Lenin*, mentions as many as twenty-four categories of socialism which have developed during the long process of social evolution. Since modern socialism was the resultant of Industrial Revolution, it either aimed at totally eliminating private enterprise, which created all manner of social maladjustments, and replacing it by State ownership, or regulating it through effective State controls, and, thus, incapacitating it from doing any social mischief. As such, the main classifications of socialism arise from the role assigned to the State in ushering in the socialistic era. In this respect, socialism stands divided into State Socialism and Co-operative

Socialism. The former wants to own and control all means of production, both big and small, and firmly believes in the sincerity of State authority to accelerate the pace of social reconstruction. The latter puts no faith in the beneficence of State action and fears that a centralised executive tends to become a social menace. State capitalism, it feels, is no answer to private capitalism because human personality is submerged in the impersonal State ownership of production machinery. It is for this reason that the noted English philosopher, Herbert Spencer, expressed the extreme view that "all socialism involves slavery." Therefore, Co-operative Socialism wants individual enterprise to be run on co-operative lines, and the State to play the benevolent role of fostering such co-operative undertakings. This pattern of production, besides its many other social advantages, helps in eliminating the element of exploitation which is inherent in individual ownership. And at the same time, common endeavour and pooling of resources, ensures enlargement of the quantum of wealth. Inasmuch as the fruits of labour are equally shared and enjoyed by the producers themselves, social justice is automatically disbursed. Thus, the three principal objectives of socialism—the extermination of exploitation of man by man, the raising of the volume of production, and the guaranteeing of social justice—are achieved without much dependence on the State machine.

Closely allied with the above two categories of socialism are two other varieties *i.e.* Revolutionary Socialism and Evolutionary Socialism. The former, because of its impatience to overhaul the economic structure, advocates quick radical action, and even coercive methods, while the latter wants socialism to extend itself gradually in the social framework. For this purpose, an appropriate social climate is created, and the values and attitudes of the people are reconditioned through the medium of liberal education. These two factors provide a healthy background for the growth of socialism. The economics of Evolutionary Socialism are, by and large, based on the views of Jevons and Mill, than on the rigid doctrines of Marx and Lenin. Some socialist writers maintain that *Labour and The New Social Order*, the famous manifesto issued by the British Labour Party in 1918, represents "the best and the clearest short exposition" of Evolutionary Socialism. It is a truism that socialism can never be imposed on the people, because socialism aims at transforming the entire social system. The process of socialisation proceeds from the social fabric itself. For that reason in *Progress and Poverty*, Henry George, the American propounder of single tax theory, writes: "The ideal of socialism is grand and noble; and it is, I am convinced, possible of realization; but such a state of society cannot be manufactured—it must grow. Society is an organism, not a machine."

EQUITY AND EQUALITY

The two extreme categories of Revolutionary Socialism are Communism and Syndicalism, which advocate violent methods for the quick overthrow of capitalism. Since socialistic thought has been influenced, during the last few centuries, by the social urges engineered by democracy, most of the other schools of socialism, have accepted democratic and peaceful means to transform the economic system on egalitarian lines. Among the outstanding schools of Democratic Socialism are, Fabian Socialism, Guild Socialism and Christian Socialism. These three categories of socialism have been mentioned, for they possess distinct characteristics of their own, and also differ from each other in a marked manner.

V

FABIAN Socialism had its birth in England. It advocates the use of formal parliamentary methods to bring about institutional changes in the economic structure with the avowed object of freeing it from capitalist anarchism. It categorically rules out class struggle as the prerequisite of socialistic reconstruction. In view of the fact that Fabian Socialism pins its faith on gradualism, its concepts fit in very well with the conservative outlook of the English people. That is why it has exercised considerable influence over the development of political thought in England. All this has made the complexion of socialism in England quite different from that of the other countries which have adopted the ideal of a socialistic economy.

Guild Socialism, which also is the product of English soil, does not put much reliance on the parliamentary technique to implement the socialistic programme. It wants labour to organise, not with a view to maximising its collective bargaining capacity by forming trade unions, but to manage both production and distribution, on the lines of guilds that existed in the ages gone by. As the political approach of Guild Socialism is at variance with the English parliamentary way of life, and its economic thesis is not in tune with the spirit of the times, but is more or less of a revivalist nature, it has not gained much popularity.

Christian Socialism originated in Europe in 1848 as a movement for applying Christian ethics to social reform, and was led by Maurice and Kingsley. The ideas of Blanc and Buchez, to a great extent, provided inspiration to Christian Socialism. It has been the mainstay of many political parties in Europe. It firmly believes that its socialistic philosophy centres round Biblical teachings. There is some lack of logic in that presumption because the philosophy of life enunciated by Christ was not in terms of economic reconstruction. But all the same, Christian Socialism

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

has moved the minds of the masses. Firstly, because its name appeals to their religious sentiments and, secondly, because it pursues a concrete programme for their social uplift and economic amelioration. Many political parties, owing allegiance to Christian Socialism, have succeeded in forming Governments in some of the European countries. It certainly goes to their credit, that though not being purely socialistic parties, they have socialised the economy of their countries in a substantial manner.

VI

FROM this cursory survey of the growth of socialistic thought it is evident that the word socialism, as such, has no specific entity, and that its content varies both in quality and in quantity. Socialism has been, and still is, in a state of confusion. Therefore, Nehru affirmatively says that "the word socialism has so many meanings that it has no precise significance left." Further, its forms are diverse in character. Even their objectives are not absolutely similar. And as far as the methods to achieve those objectives are concerned, the variance is too pronounced. This is substantiated by the fact that each country, which has experimented with the socialisation of its economy, has modified socialism in the context of its historical background, and made it conform to the actual state of its economic development and the social outlook of its people. That explains why the pattern of socialisation in China and Yugoslavia is distinctively different from that of Russia. It is even said that the Chinese communism is so Chinese, that it is no longer Marxism. Mr. Harrison Salisbury in his book *Stalin's Russia and After* traces the difference between the Russian and Chinese communism to the dissimilarity in their history and culture. Chinese leaders—perhaps for ideological reasons to maintain the unity of Marxian logic—do not emphasize this difference. In fact, it is maintained that the Chinese revolution drew its entire inspiration from the Soviet revolution. Some years ago, a foreign correspondent asked Mao Tse-tung whether Chinese communists had received any Russian aid. "A great deal," answered Mao. He opened his drawer and handed the visitor a copy of *The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*. Still, in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Mr. Hans Kohn tells us that "communism in China seemed more an indigenous agrarian revolutionary movement, born of the backward conditions of the country and the exploitation of the masses, than an integral part of the worldwide communist movement, which has its centre in Moscow." Mr. Peter Towns in his recent publication entitled, *China Phoenix: The Revolution in China*, also shows that China's revolution sprang

EQUITY AND EQUALITY

from China's soil, and that it was weakest when its theory and practice diverged from Chinese requirements. This is not surprising because China possesses a strong individuality and its personality has developed over a period of thousands of years. For that reason, Lin Yutang in his famous book *My Country and My People* asserts that "China was a civilization more than a nation."

So far as Yugoslavia is concerned, the course that socialism has taken in that country is, by and large, different from the other Marxian countries. It has evolved its own peculiar system of integrating political democracy with economic democracy. Mr. Edward Kerdelj, the Vice-President of Yugoslav Republic, in *Socialist Democracy in Yugoslav Practice*, tells in detail how socialism in Yugoslavia, after the establishment of the present regime, is quite different from the one practised in the Soviet Union.

From these illustrations, one can very well imagine the state of socialism in other socialistic or neo-socialistic countries which have never accepted Marxism as the sole determinant of their social policies. For instance, in England much re-thinking is being done on the concept of nationalisation which is regarded as the mainstay of orthodox socialism. The fermentation of thought on a creative level has become more pronounced since the termination of the Second World War. England's attachment to socialism is becoming more rational than emotional. A feeling has grown that indiscriminate nationalisation tends to dehumanise workers, because of the paternal control that State corporations exercise over Trade Unionism. This way of thinking has made Prof. Arthur Lewis, who is leading an important section of intellectual socialists, to take the stand that "a society in which each person owned an equal amount of property would come nearer to the socialist ideal than the one in which the Government owned all property."

The diverse manner in which socialism has been interpreted in different countries does not in any way discredit the concept of socialism. On the other hand, it is a tribute to socialism that it is a living, vital philosophy, possessing the elasticity to adapt itself to the objective conditions of various nations. Whatever may be the value of precise theories, a blind-fold adherence to their postulates, unmindful of the peculiar social environment of a country, is bound to arrest the all-round development of the community. It is increasingly being realised that a doctrine, instead of giving appropriate social inspiration, tends to become a wasting asset. All this is logical because too much faith in preconceived notions hampers the natural growth of social thought.

CHAPTER FIVE

DOCTRINE OF DETERMINISM

The principal narrowness of Political Economists is that of regarding their present experience of mankind as of universal validity, mistaking temporary phases of human character for human nature itself.

—AUQUSTE COMTE

THE distinction between capitalism and socialism is marked, because both these economic systems are diametrically opposed to each other. But, there is no such compartmentalism between socialism and communism. Karl Marx, while evolving his new social philosophy, purposely used the word communism, as socialism was being freely interpreted in different ways. Even then, terminological confusion continued, and both socialism and communism, were often used as mutually inclusive equivalents. That is why for the correct understanding of Marxian Socialism, *The Communist Manifesto* was considered as the proper authority. Since the communist society, that Marx conceived of, was much more radical than the one visualised by traditional socialists, in his *Criticism of the Gotha Programme*, he attempted to differentiate between the communist and socialist ideologies. He said that in a communist regime, a person would contribute to the communal property, according to his ability, and would receive therefrom for his use, according to his needs. Thus, the consumption share of an individual would have no relation with his actual produce, but with his wants. It may be mentioned that some scholars hold that the communistic slogan: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs," was first used by Louis Blanc, the French radical leader. Of course, Marx lent worldwide popularity to the slogan by making it the pivot of his revolutionary economic philosophy.

However, it was left to Lenin to lay down a precise and clear-cut distinction between the connotation of socialism and communism. In his historic book, *State and Revolution*, he stated that socialism represented only the first phase of a socialised economy and that communism stood for the higher phase. The significance of this distinction can be appreciated from the fact that the Russian State is still called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and not Communist Republics. This is logical, because in its present state of social progress and economic advancement, the Russian

DOCTRINE OF DETERMINISM

system represents, more or less, the first phase. But, in view of the fact that the object of the party in power is the attainment of the higher phase, it calls itself a Communist Party. In this respect, credit certainly goes to the Russian leaders that they have not been presumptuous in calling their State "Communist" when their country is still in the preparatory stage of socialism.

II

KARL MARX evolved his special methodology of dialectics in analysing the meaning and purpose of social processes. The burden of his peculiar argumentation was that economic impulses alone motivate human action. That being his presumption, he came to the conclusion that as the capitalist apparatus spreads its wings, the conflict between the employer and the employee, would increase in geometrical progression, because "men always act solely out of their class interests." And this clash of economic interests would result in the intensification of class struggle. The logicity of intensified class antagonism was further justified by his Labour Theory of Value, The Theory of Ever-increasing Surplus and the growing concentration of wealth, which would enable the industrialists to extract larger share of profits, while labour would just continue slaving for petty wages. That explains why in his famous treatise, *The Capital*, Marx condemned capital as dead labour "that vampire-like, lives only by sucking living labour, and lives the more, the more labour it sucks." He further visualised that as the pace of industrialism advances, monopolistic pattern of production would dominate the economic field. Although these giant business concerns would give tremendous power and command to the capitalists, they would at the same time provide greater opportunities to the labourers to organise themselves as a cohesive, well-integrated body. And when homogeneity, under the stress of common suffering, reaches its highest pitch, the working class would rise as a man, and forcibly overthrow the capitalist order of society. After that, the labour force, being united and disciplined, would take over State administration. With the extinction of private enterprise, gradation in social system would end, and only one class, represented by the proletariat would dominantly rule the land. That being the social pattern of society, the workers would form themselves into a monolithic political party for the governance of the country. This political party does not represent the end of the revolutionary struggle, but is regarded as a powerful instrument in establishing a truly classless society. What happens to the party when such a society becomes a reality? The answer is given by Stalin. In a speech in 1924, he said: "As

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

soon as classes have been abolished, and the dictatorship of the proletariat has been done away with, the (Communist) party will have fulfilled its mission and can be allowed to disappear."

In the communist text books, the immediate goal of a mass revolt against the capitalistic order is set as the establishment of a dictatorial Government. The communists make no secret of their detestation of democracy. This is quite clear from the words of Lenin that Marxists wait for an opportunity "to crush, to smash to bits, to wipe off the face of the earth, the bourgeois State machinery." The communists believe that a government formed by the proletariat alone is capable of discharging its real social obligations. "The executive of the modern State," Engels proclaimed, "was but a committee for managing the common affairs of the bourgeoisie." Though every form, tradition, or convention of parliamentary democracy is destroyed, adult suffrage, which is the primary vehicle of full-fledged democracy, is granted to the people. But this political freedom is in name only, because there exists only one political party, omnipotent and all-pervasive, which is supposed to represent the entire nation. Elections, even if held periodically, are nothing but an eyewash. People just vote for the only contestant. That being so, Prof. Colin Clark, the British Economist, asserts that "mere granting of adult suffrage is no guarantee for political opposition. The right of voting was given, both in Stalin's Russia and Hitler's Germany but that did not mean that the right of opposition to the ruling party was present in those countries." As a matter of fact, in a communist State, abhorrence of political rivalry is so intense, that if any opposition, at any level, raises its head, it is ruthlessly eliminated, and condemned as a counter-revolutionary activity. The police has all the power to arrest a person, and detain him indefinitely, without any judicial trial. Suppressive methods employed by Marxian Governments, have made Mr. Francis Watson write in *Revolution and Communism*, that "communism is gradually taking the shape of totalitarianism and terrorism." And Eastman, who has lately developed a deep hatred against Marxism, goes to the extent of declaring that the communists are laying "the tracks along which another death train will travel." All forces, social, cultural and political, are moulded to the set pattern of the State. Regimentation of society is so thorough that no individual is given any opportunity to express any view at variance with the basic policies of the State. Even ordinary rights of citizenship are denied, and as Mr. Raymond Postage, in his book, *Communism and the Government Machine*, says, "at no point has the worker any right against the State. He has no means, whatsoever of resisting the Governmental authority which is assumed always to be doing him good." It is for these reasons that communism stripped of its propagandist

DOCTRINE OF DETERMINISM

frills is regarded "not so much a liberating force as an irremovable tyranny, the like of which the world has never seen before."

III

AN all-powerful centralised State is the reflection of communist ideology. But it is maintained that in the course of time, the State will wither away. Dictatorship is regarded as a transitional institution and full democracy is set as the final social goal. This means that decentralisation of the highest Utopian conception will emerge out of a tight centralised State machinery. What are the actual chances of such a Stateless society coming into being, the future alone can tell. At the moment, the Russian scene shows no sign whatsoever of the emergence of a free society in which individuals manage their own affairs without any outside control or interference. Discussing this subject in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Mr. Hans Kohn writes: "The State in Russia under communist dictatorship has not yet begun to wither away, but is the first example of the truly totalitarian State in which no sphere of individual life is allowed to remain outside its all inclusive grip."

According to the present social thought, decentralisation emanating from stiff centralisation, seems nothing short of a political phantasy. Even in the economic field, where production is planned for the promotion of social good, Vinobaji maintains that "the communists are under the illusion that decentralised distribution would definitely follow centralised production." And so far as the dispersal of State authority is concerned, Aldous Huxley, in *Ends and Means* holds the view that a centralised State may be "smashed by war or overturned by revolution from below; there is not the slightest reason to suppose that it will wither away."

It is but logical that any State, whatever be its political philosophy, will only distribute its functions, if it reposes faith in the goodness of human nature, and helps in the all-round development of human personality. But Marxism believes that individual freedom conflicts with the proper and adequate functioning of the State apparatus. To achieve ruthless efficiency, individual initiative in every social sphere is discouraged. In fact, all manner of fetters are installed around human activity, and man is made to function as a mere automaton in the giant State machine. Heavy rod, and not the gentle art of persuasion is employed to improve man, as he is considered a socially mischievous being. Let us hear what Prof. Arnold J. Toynbee, the noted historian-philosopher, has to say regarding the status of an individual in a Marxian society. He writes: "The high valuation of the individual personality in the

West is being challenged to-day by communism and other totalitarian ideologies which deify the human community, and maintain that the individual human being exists for the sake of the community, as the ant exists for the sake of the ant heap, and the bee for the sake of the beehive. If this totalitarian exaltation of the community were to prevail over our liberal Western belief in the sacredness of the personality, that would, I should say, be the death of the distinctive ideal for which the West stands."

No importance is attached to human personality because mind is regarded as "a mere derivative of matter." Further, religion is considered as the opium of the people. Plekhanov called it "a peculiar emotion and mystic sentiment." The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, some years ago declared: "We reject religion in order to clear and prepare the way for injecting into the consciousness of the toilers the basic principles of Marxian science." Marxism unreservedly affirms its hatred against moral values. The communist concept of morality is something entirely different from the one that has ever prevailed since the dawn of human civilization. Defining this strange concept, Lenin said: "Morality is what serves to destroy the old exploiting society, and to unite all the toilers around the proletariat, which is creating a new communist society."

It is true communism has remarkably succeeded in toning the material well-being of the people. But the hard process of regimentation and the inhumanities of totalitarianism, have slowly killed the real man in man. Economic advance is essential to ameliorate the living conditions of the masses. Nevertheless, economic progress does not necessarily mean true progress. Genuine social improvement can only be achieved if moral principles provide inspiration to material effort. "No human being, and no society of human beings," says T.H. Huxley, the distinguished biologist, "ever did, or ever will, come to much, unless their conduct was governed and guided by the love of some ethical ideal."

Since man is supposed to be a mere by-product of matter, the abundance, colour and variety of life have no meaning in a Marxian society. Man's mode of thinking is reduced to that of a robot. Through scientific indoctrination, the attitude of human beings is so processed that their social behaviour resembles the involuntary functioning of factory produced machines, which bear a number but have no name. The whole existence of man begins and ends in the narrow and restricted world of gross materialism. Neither the soft beauty of ethics, nor the exhilaration of moral standards, has any place in the communistic valuation. Hatred, not love, is the source of social inspiration. That explains why no finer distinction is drawn between the means and ends. In the achievement of objectives, the propriety of action is considered as the

DOCTRINE OF DETERMINISM

relic of decadent feudal moralists. The terms, fair and foul, truth and falsehood, are treated as mutually inclusive. Even "cunning" is praised as a worthy motive, and "unlawful methods" are taken for granted as a part of the revolutionary strategy. In short, the ends justify the most ignoble means. But, this argument, Aneurin Bevan, the British Labour leader, very appropriately says, "ends in a moral morass. Ends are but an accumulation of means and it is in these that men live their lives."

This attitude of cynicism towards moral values, ridiculing the concept of individual initiative, and hatred against free democratic institutions, are but the resultant of the central belief that economic factors alone are the determinant of human thought, and the regulator of social action. No one denies that economic considerations play an important part in shaping human conduct. It is difficult to disagree with the German socialist leader, Edward Bernstein, when he writes in *Evolutionary Socialism* : "The economic interpretation of history does not necessarily mean that all events are determined solely by economic forces. It simply means that economic facts are the ever recurring decisive forces, the chief points in the process of history." But undue and exaggerated importance that is attached to economic impulses in exclusion to other equally relevant humanistic urges, has reduced Marxism to an inflexible body of rigid doctrines. The breadth of thinking is so much narrowed down to the materialistic conception of history that economic determinism alone is presumed to hold the key to social evolution. But, economic determinism, as Mr. M. N. Roy pointed out in his second volume of *Reason, Romanticism and Revolution*, published after his death, "is deduced from a wrong interpretation of the materialist philosophy." That is why the theoretical basis on which Marx built the essentials of his economic philosophy, have been amply falsified by the course of events. The impending doom of capitalism is nowhere in sight. The working class remains unorganised, except in a few odd countries, and thereto, cohesion is forced by periodic purges. Cliques and counter-cliques, inside the Government and outside, scheming for coups and capture of power, are not infrequent. Political solidarity, under the inspiration of a common cause, is not an established fact. But all the same, communists believe that power politics is inevitable in any form of society except their own. Again, the prospect of world domination by the universally organised proletariat dangles as the dreamland of the Marxian intellectual loyalists. The working class has failed to emerge as an integrated social force, because the "economic man" of the Marxian conception resides only in the doctrinal manuals. Considering the anti-communistic character of the economies of most of the countries, one is inclined to ask whether Marx was serious

or he was just indulging in high pressure propaganda, when he declared: "Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!"

From the standpoint of actual results achieved through typically non-Marxian techniques, India has many things to her credit. The inevitable use of organised violence to wrest freedom from alien rulers, has been completely negated by the Gandhian practice of non-violent non-co-operation. The tremendous conflict between British imperialism and Indian nationalism was solved with the help of methods which Marx had categorically dismissed as too unrealistic. The philosophy of *Satyagraha* gave a new meaning, a new interpretation, a new apparatus to the concept of class war. After independence, the mighty problem of feudalism and princely order was also solved through peaceful and negotiatory means. The solution of such problems in other countries was largely found through blood and bayonets. The unprecedented progress of the Bhoodan movement stands like a monument of challenge to the very concept and theory of class struggle. The one-man crusade has demonstrated, beyond any doubt, the tremendous utility of moral persuasion in bringing about far-reaching social and economic changes. It has been proved that humanitarian approach can be as effective, if not even more, than the sanction of State authority. The success of Mixed Economy has revitalised the ancient Indian tradition that the rich, in spite of their crude sense of acquisitiveness, can respond to the finer call of social good. The abundant use of parliamentary methods to reshape the socio-economic system has rebutted the contention that progress can only be achieved through regimentation of social organism.

Again, in the context of present-day economics, the Marxian Labour Theory of Value, the Theory of Surplus Value, the Theory of Prices and the Law of Increasing Misery, hardly bear any validity. Extensive State controls, progressive labour legislation, high rates of taxation, imposition of death duties, health insurance and other welfare measures, at the cost of the capitalists, have taken the wind out of Marxian assumptions. That is why Marxism has come to be regarded as an out-of-date dogma. In fact, as far as fifty years ago, Boehm-Bawerk had declared that Marxian system of economics had come to an end. After that, Keynes also arrived at the conclusion that Marxism, in the age of welfare economics, was almost a spent up force. Of course, professors of metaphysics and philosophy, have always looked at Marxism with indignant indifference. And, so far as the historians are concerned, they have, in vain, tried to locate any set pattern, and if any has been traced by Toynbee, it is anything but of the Marxian variety.

DOCTRINE OF DETERMINISM

Moreover, what Marx wrote related to conditions as they obtained in Europe nearly a century ago. As such, his entire economic thesis rests on the energetics of coal and iron. But the world to-day has entered the atomic age. This new and dynamic step forward, was never visualised by Marx. Consequently, the shape of things to come, was not taken into consideration by him while he was engaged in spinning out his economic theories. On that account, Nehru says: "It would be highly unfair to Marx himself, if any people were to say that Marx's teachings were good enough in every respect in the present-day world. I cannot understand how books written 80 years ago by Marx, with a European background, need necessarily apply to a background in India 80 years after. The trouble is that our communist brethren have crammed some tenets or the other of Marx, and consider them as a *mantra*, to be recited at every occasion, and to solve every problem." That being so, it will not be wrong to call the modern Marxists as a new kind of "religious fanatics" to whom everything said by Marx is gospel truth. Mr. Richard B. Gregg, the noted Gandhian economist, discussing the merits and demerits of the various "isms" in his book, *Which Way Lies Hope*, writes: "The great statements of communism,—Marx's *Capital*, Engel's *Anti-Duhring*, and the writings of Lenin and Stalin,—are revered in much the same way as the scriptures of old religion."

IV

ALTHOUGH Marxism has lost much of its potentiality in determining the course of human history, it is not denied that Marx was essentially a dynamic personality, a propounder of an extraordinary philosophy. Even Mr. John Plamentz, who in *German Marxism and Russian Communism* calls Marx's scientific socialism "a logical absurdity, a myth, and a revolutionary slogan," admits that Marx was "a truly great and original thinker." A study of Marxian literature sharpens intellect and his unorthodox approach makes one think afresh of the various social problems. In a certain measure, it also helps in understanding the significance of complex social processes. But the consideration of Marxism, as the only basis of aggregate social behaviour, tends to lead one astray from the path of rational thinking because allegiance to economic determinism destroys the elemental sense of objectivity. That explains why the Marxian loyalists usually find themselves lost in the blind alley which runs along all well-set doctrines.

Marxism is, no doubt, a back-datish dogma. Still it should not be regarded as an ancient superstition. In spite of its many faults and failings, Marxism does serve as a guide in understanding the

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

transformation of feudalism into mercantalism, and then to capitalism. It also assists in grasping the whys and whereofs of economic depressions that follow in the wake of free competitive economy. Its usefulness in knowing the nature of the State, and analysing the sociology of knowledge, cannot be refuted. It may also be mentioned that the Marxian approach is not exclusively confined to matters pertaining to politics and economics. In some fields of research, it serves a useful purpose. Research scholars, even of Archaeology and Zoology, hold that the Marxian dialectics has helped them in the pursuit of their intricate subjects.

Admittedly, Marxism has a value of its own in understanding social disciplines, the character of capitalism, and the significance of political forces. But exclusive reliance on it tends to convert innocent social workers into disruptive political agitators. Nevertheless, a slight Marxian touch in our social outlook will always make us remember that material well-being is the prerequisite of social well-being and that no man can be a patriot on an empty stomach. Study of Marxism will also create a consciousness in us about the urgency of rendering social justice to suffering humanity. It will further impress upon our mind the fact that political freedom is only a means to achieve economic freedom and that "freedom cannot live in the modern world except as it keeps house with peace and plenty."

V

AFTER the October Revolution of 1917, Kremlin appropriated the privilege of interpreting every facet of Marxian ideology. For that reason when Comintern, i.e., The Third International, was founded in 1919, the Right-wing socialists who believed in liberal socialism, formed themselves into social democrats, and the Leftist socialist parties hitched themselves to the lodestar of the Russian controlled Comintern. Communist Parties exist all over the world. In some countries they function only in name, while in others they are quite vigorous. But their sycophancy to Kremlin is so abject and grovelling that whatever is "passed on" to them is accepted as the real wish of Marx and the true intention of Lenin. No heed is paid to the obvious fact that Russia has been applying communist teachings in the light of its peculiar social experiences, and to promote its own national interests. The intellectual surrender is so thorough that the communists go about in the political bazars as peddlers hawking the Moscow brand of Marxism, knowing little of its intrinsic worth and practical utility. The political slogans of Russia are repeated *ad nauseam* without caring to know whether they fitted into their country's social environment. They even adopt the

DOCTRINE OF DETERMINISM

national emblem of Russia as their party flag. This state of servileness had forced Gandhiji to remark that "the communists seem to take their instructions from Russia, whom they regard as their spiritual home rather than India. I cannot countenance this dependence on an outside power." This involuntary adherence to Russian determination has taken away all objectivity from other communist parties and made their policies unpredictable. Their policies to use the famous Churchillian phrase, are a "riddle wrapped in a mystery, inside an enigma." No wonder, the record of the Communist Party of India is nothing but a ludicrous hotch-potch of caprice and craze. To bring home the whimsical pattern of communist functioning in our country, a few glaring examples are cited.

Up to 1927, the communists, in a great measure, were co-operating with the Congress to win back the lost freedom. But when Russia reorientated the well-known colonial thesis of Lenin, the Congress began to be defamed as the agent of industrial magnates and feudal lords. The communists even had the temerity to charge the great patriotic organisation with working insidiously to forge an understanding with British Imperialism. The shout went around that Gandhian leadership was betraying the masses. However, in 1935, in pursuance of a directive from the World Congress of the Communist International which met in Moscow, the Communist Party discarded its policy of extreme leftism and the "reactionary Congress" came to be regarded as the national forum for the struggle for independence. So much so that when in 1940 Individual *Satyagraha* was launched by Gandhiji, the communists simply clamoured for a bolder mass action. But, when the Quit India Movement actually went into operation in 1942, the Congress was accused of consciously functioning as "the fifth column of Fascism." This political about-face in national policy was due to the fact that in 1940 the Russo-German Pact of Non-Aggression was still in existence, whereas in 1942 Stalin was at war with Hitler. The sordid things that the communist leaders, freshly released from jails, did to sabotage the freedom movement are too vile to be recalled even. It will not be an exaggeration to say that British Imperialism was supported in a manner which made the Nawabs and Jagirdars feel small in their loyalties to Whitehall.

When India attained independence, the Communist Party was directed to carry on its revolutionary programme. Believing that the administration had not been fully consolidated, it let loose an orgy of violence, loot and murder in Bengal, and Telengana in particular, to create conditions of civil war to overthrow the infant National Government. Nehru, the shining star of Indian patriotism, was pooh-poohed as "a British collaborator" and "a stooge of the capitalist bloc." But now his foreign policy is praised as

an instrument of world peace. The reason for this topsy-turvy change is that Russia has subscribed to the just and dynamic philosophy of co-existence and mutual co-operation. Peace loving people all the world over, admire Russia for having shown the boldness and generosity in accepting the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence.

These few facts of history indubitably prove that the communists change their strategy not in the interests of Mother India, but to further the cause of the Communist Fatherland, at whose bidding they march to the left, to the right, to the front and to the rear. Rightly has Prof. Shriman Narayan, the Congress General Secretary, observed that "the communists have no independent wisdom of their own. If the line changes in Russia, their line in India also undergoes a change."

It is because of this slavish mentality that the Indian communists have failed to produce any literature which attempts to interpret the Marxian philosophy in the context of the actuality of Indian social conditions. Their mind is too full of Russian achievements, and the tongue too busy in denouncing their own country. No one denies that Russia has made tremendous advance. But to ridicule one's own progression is to betray extra territorial loyalties. Since their knowledge is theoretical, and its application is dictated by men sitting thousands of miles away, knowing little of the essentials of Indian existence, the Indian communists have invariably been caught on the wrong foot. One cannot help concluding that their political record is nothing else but a zig-zag series of blunders and betrayals.

CHAPTER SIX

STAR OF SARVODAYA

*Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom ;
Lead thou me on !
The night is dark, and I am far from home ;
Lead thou me on !
Keep thou my feet : I do not ask to see
The distant scene ; one step enough for me.*

—CARDINAL NEWMAN: THE PILLAR OF THE CLOUD

IT is frequently asked: Why has not the Congress used the word "Sarvodaya" in place of the Westernised phrase "socialistic pattern of society" in describing the country's objective? Does it mean that the proposed Welfare State, based on a socialised economy, is going to be something different from the Sarvodaya society, as conceived by Gandhiji? Is there any basic incompatibility between the two social goals? Or, is the new order, as enunciated by the Sarvodaya philosophy, and the socialist pattern, as planned by the Congress equivalent? Some confusion seems to prevail in respect of these questions. This confusion must be removed, for it arrests the growth of integrated thinking which is the prerequisite of concentrated social effort. Moreover, if the feeling persists that the Sarvodaya ideal is at variance with the Congress objective, harmonious collaboration between the Sarva Seva Sangh and the Congress, will not be of the same standard as is most needed to-day, when India has launched on the unique experiment of establishing an equalitarian social system through peaceful, democratic means.

Sarvodaya is certainly a better word than socialism, and stands for a school of thought which is typical of Indian traditions. Yet, it has no historical context behind it. It is also true, as seen in an earlier chapter, that socialism has many meanings and has been interpreted in diverse ways in different countries. Nevertheless, socialism does stand for certain concrete economic ends and its social purposes are generally understood by the mass of the people. Besides Sarvodaya is such a great and noble word that for a political party to employ it as its social goal would be an act of impropriety. Let it be categorically stated that the Congress has no desire whatsoever to exploit this lofty expression for political purposes. The Congress is conscious of its faults and failings. It honestly feels that at present it does not possess the full title to

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

use the word Sarvodaya. Only a saintly social reformer cum-politician like Acharya Vinoba Bhave is qualified to propagate the Sarvodaya ideal, because he is not only living upto it, but is also trying to make others live upto it.

Sarvodaya is essentially a politico-religious concept, and encompasses a wider spiritual connotation. To have accepted it as the national destination would have been both premature and presumptuous. As time rolls on, and the moral stature of the Congress rises higher and higher, and the organisation feels worthy of adopting Sarvodaya as its objective, it might do so. But, at the moment, it has kept Sarvodaya as the distant goal to be reached through constant self-purification and continuous social service. Throughout the ages, idealism has supplied inspiration to mankind. In *Practicable Socialism*, Mr. Cannon Barnett tells us that "an ideal gives invaluable service, it provides the distant view, which makes progress, as it makes a walk, exhilarating." Gandhians should realise the limitations of the Congress, and feel assured, that the socialist pattern is a practical approximation to Sarvodaya. Top-ranking leaders have repeatedly affirmed that the Congress sincerely desires to pursue the Sarvodaya philosophy, as best as it can, under the existing circumstances.

II

SARVODAYA in modern terminology may be stated to be a synthesis—loose and indeterminate, of course—of agrarian socialism, evolutionary socialism and ethical socialism. Apart from its economic aspects and social aims, Sarvodaya enunciates a way of life, symbolising the noble teachings of Gandhiji. By using the word Sarvodaya, Gandhiji did not intend to place before the country a bare programme for economic reconstruction. The word was pregnant with significant meaning, and suggested to him, as to others, the dawn of a just humane era.

Broadly speaking, Sarvodaya aims at providing the fullest possible opportunity for the all-round development of the individual and the society, by bringing about a countrywide decentralisation, of both political and economic power. Perhaps such was the society which Browning had in his mind, when he talked of

*That far land we dream about,
Where every man is his own architect.*

Taking into consideration the essentials of Indian conditions, a socialist society could only mean Sarvodaya, because the country being under-developed, and having an agrarian economic base, decentralisation is imperative for social stability. Thus, there is very little variation between the Sarvodaya ideal and the socia-

list objective, since both aim at furnishing full scope for material and moral progress.

The Sarvodaya concept contains the maximum content of egalitarianism, and the socialist pattern is the minimum and immediate realisation of that high idealism. Therefore, those who try to draw an anti-thesis between the Sarvodaya belief and the Congress creed, raise controversies which are, to say the least, meaningless and unnecessary. If any doubt still persists, it should be set at rest by the words of Vinobaji, than whom to-day, none else understands the philosophy of Sarvodaya better. The spiritual heir of Gandhiji says : "What does socialism mean? Its meaning is not to be determined by the dictates of dictionary. It would mean a system for which we want to prepare society. That is why we have liked this word and while speaking on it, I said only this much that this work shall have to be completed in a definite period. Non-violence should be accepted as an integral part of socialism. And, if we add non-violence in the Congress resolution, it will directly mean Sarvodaya. The question is then asked : Why did not they use the word Sarvodaya ? I do not attach much importance to this aspect of the question. They are not using the word Sarvodaya because the outside world is not familiar with its exact meaning."

III

THE Sanskrit word Sarvodaya was coined by Gandhiji, as a parallel to the phrase "unto this last"—the title of a book by Ruskin, the 19th century English reformer. This volume, Gandhiji says in *My Experiments With Truth*, "brought an instantaneous and practical transformation in my life." He found some of his deepest convictions reflected in this great book. Later on, he translated it into Gujarati, entitling it Sarvodaya (The Welfare of All). Ruskin, in choosing the title of his publication, had been inspired by a moral parable of Jesus Christ.

Sarvodaya stands for the good of all and not merely for the greatest good of the greatest number. This Western idea of the greatest good of the greatest number is rejected, for it contains the germs of minority and majority problems. According to this concept, a section of the community has the right to benefit at the expense of another section. Consequently, some would prosper by throwing others into wretchedness. Needless to say, this social strategy would set in motion a series of conflicts between different classes. Conflicts engender hatred, greed and intolerance, which in turn disrupt the very texture of social fabric.

On the other hand, if an attempt were made to bring about

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

a change in the lives of all, clashes and frictions would be easily avoided. How is that to be done ? The answer is best provided by Gandhiji : " I will give you a talisman. Whenever you are in doubt, or when the self becomes too much with you, apply the following test. Recall the face of the poorest and the weakest man whom you may have seen, and ask yourself, if the step you contemplate, is going to be of any use to him. Will he gain anything by it ? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to *Swaraj* for the hungry and spiritually starving millions ? Then you will find your doubt and yourself melting away."

Sarvodaya—the welfare of all—has been the pivotal idea of Gandhiji's philosophy right from the time he wrote his book *Hind Swaraj*. Words have power and Sarvodaya is one of these great words of immense power. It symbolises the revolutionary ideology of Gandhiji—that if you first take care of the most oppressed and the neglected, the nation as a whole would rise.

CHAPTER SEVEN

FRATERNITY OF FREE MEN

Forsooth, brethern, fellowship is heaven and lack of fellowship is hell, fellowship is life and lack of fellowship is death ; and the deeds that ye do upon the earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them.

—WILLIAM MORRIS: DREAM OF JOHN BALL

AFTER the passing away of Gandhiji, constructive workers from all over India assembled at Sevagram in March 1948, and formed an organisation known as the Sarvodaya Samaj. Its aim was to "strive towards a society based on truth and non-violence, in which there would be no distinctions of class or creed, no opportunity for exploitation and full scope for the development of both individuals, as well as groups." Its basic principle was insistence on the purity of the means as that of the end. It was a sort of brotherhood and by no means a closely-knit and disciplined organisation. The reason being that Gandhiji had never believed in external sanctions, and had always pinned his faith in the inner sanction to regulate one's conduct. Indeed, the Samaj was to be a spiritual fraternity of men who tried to mould their lives according to the Master's precepts. Gandhiji was not a mystic and his teachings were not meant only for those who had renounced the world. They had a tremendous practical import, and anyone, whatever his social status and vocation, could benefit from them. The bond between the members was to be their common faith and the common ideals which they all held. The importance of a general faith as an instrument of social cohesion is brought home by Mr. Delisle Burns in his book *Political Ideals*. He tells us that "a common memory and a common ideal—these, more than a common blood, make a nation." The Sarvodaya Samaj was to be a conceptual association of men and women having homogeneity of belief in the pattern of life they wanted to live. This was the right approach. Discussing the merits and demerits of forming an organisation to achieve an ideal, Mr. Ramsay Muir, in *An Autobiography*, correctly says: "The noblest movements are apt to outlive their usefulness when their zeal develops into formation: an ideal creates an institution, and then the institution suffocates the ideal."

A middle course between having no organisation, and letting believers in the Gandhian way of life being tossed about by cross

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

currents, and forming a strict, well-defined association based on some organisational compulsion, and having a set of dogmas for the guidance of its members, was thus adopted. If the teachings of Gandhiji had been reduced to precise doctrines, then in time to come, the professing followers would have remained content with their mere form and lost the spirit of the teachings. Such has been the experience where teachings of the saints have been compressed into aphorisms, or code of conduct. It is a well-known fact that Gandhiji, whenever approached to write a text book of general maxims refused to do so, because he believed in the fundamental principles alone, and these principles had to be applied to the day-to-day problems as they arose. The solution was to be found in the occasion and not in any reference book. Every thought and line of action was to be tested on the touchstone of truth and non-violence. On that account, the Sarvodaya Samaj has not produced any text book of generalisations. The Gandhian literature on the various items of constructive programme is recommended to members for their guidance.

The Samaj being a brotherhood, its membership is necessarily different from that of normal associations. Anyone who believes in the primary principles of truth and non-violence, and insists on the purity of the means as that of the end, can become a member. There is no external authority to check his activities. He is free from all organisational control. The adherence to the Gandhian way of life is to be judged, not by any outside authority, but by the conscience within. A member is both his master and servant. Membership carries no right; nor does it confer any prestige. The duty of expressing the Master's teachings in the daily life is, however, enjoined upon the member. He is expected to do some constructive work and serve the people. Service is essential, as it brings about a sense of social unity.

The Samaj by itself does not undertake any work or programme. It is service alone that gives it, and its members, status and respect. A person may not formally enrol himself as a member. If he believes in truth and non-violence as the only correct conduct, he can deem himself to be a member of the Samaj. The Sarvodaya Samaj is not confined to India alone. Any person living anywhere in the world, can become its member; the condition of membership being faith in truth and non-violence and service of the people. Membership has been thrown open to men and women of all countries because humanity like Truth is indivisible. Geographical divisions do not separate man from man. Emphasising this aspect of human unity, in *The Outline of History*, H.G. Wells, writes: "Our true nationality is mankind."

II

THE most practical picture of a Sarvodaya society can be presented if we imagine a community organised on the model of a family. In a family, its members enjoy wealth according to their needs, irrespective of the money they earn. Members have concern for each other's needs, and do nothing which might injure others. This common outlook, and a corporate way of living, instills stability in family life and conduces to its happiness.

In the present pattern of society, social life functions under the dichotomy of two compartments—the home and worldly life. While in the family its members share what they have in common, yet, outside they exploit people to become rich. The standard of conduct in the home is dissimilar to the one outside. Unadulterated goodness in family life is recognised. But to pursue worldly life, it is assumed that this goodness must be mingled with some evil. Needless to emphasise, such an attitude gives rise to social disharmony.

The basic cause of conflict between man and man, and clash of interests between different social classes, lies in the passion to amass wealth. Prof. Bertrand Russell in *Principles of Social Reconstruction* asserts : "It is preoccupation with possession, more than anything else, that prevents man from living freely and nobly." In this race to accumulate wealth, regardless of the needs of others, the gulf between the poor and the rich widens. Let us hear what Vinobaji has to say on the social consequences of greed for money. The noble man declares that "owing to the importance attached to wealth, concord among mankind, instead of becoming natural and easy, has become extremely difficult." Having diagnosed the malady, he gives the remedy also : "Have concern for other's needs, and do not mind your own needs in a manner as would cause hardship to others. The observance of this rule would contribute to Sarvodaya."

Our views about property shall have to undergo a revolutionary change if we are to build a society on the Gandhian lines. "Taken generally, all our institutions and their working," says Prof. Laski, "are conditioned by the property relations of any given society. The dominant ideas and principles of that society will be set by the way in which, in any moment, its property relations are working." The main difference between the Western type of democracy and Sarvodaya is that the former treats property as something sacrosanct and respects it as the symbol of the inviolable right of an individual. So much so that John Locke, the English philosopher, in his *Treatise on Government*, expresses the view that "the reason why men enter into society is the preservation of their property." This high estimate of individual property is not

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

accepted by the Sarvodaya philosophy. The concept of Sarvodaya is based on the belief that whatever is earned by man should be dedicated to the promotion of social good, except what is required for his daily needs. The wealthy, of course, are not to be deprived of their possessions, for to do that force would have to be employed, and violence creates more problems than it solves. Furthermore, society will not gain much by this strategy of expropriation. In truth, it stands to suffer as it will lose the capabilities of men who know the art of creating wealth. The Sarvodaya way is to leave the rich in possession of their wealth and ask them to act as trustees for the superfluous wealth that they own. Such an approach is even commended by the American industrialist, Mr. Andrew Carnegie. In *The Gospel of Wealth*, he says: "Surplus wealth is a sacred trust which its possessor is bound to administer in his life time for the good of the community."

In this increasingly inter-dependent world, no man can claim that he earns his wealth solely by his own efforts, and therefore, he is its absolute master to use it in any manner he likes. The acceptance of the theory of trusteeship means the building up of a social system which takes from each according to his capacity and gives to each according to his needs. Only then the Sarvodaya ideal of sharing in common and working for the service of all will be realised.

Truly, the question of property presents a big social problem inasmuch as it has a natural attraction for the people. It might bring some kind of joy and satisfaction to the individual, but its accumulation in the hands of a few tends to cause social unbalance and unhappiness. Analysing the social ill-effects of the institution of private wealth, Tolstoy, in *What Shall We Do?* holds that "money is a new form of slavery, and distinguishable from the old, simply by the fact, that it is impersonal—that there is no human relation between master and slave." But what is the way out of this social dilemma? The choice lies between expropriating the rich, or persuading them to fulfil their social duties. "In accordance with our moral traditions," President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, says, "we have to solve the problem of property through moral strength." A proper atmosphere, therefore, has to be created to make the rich conscious of their social obligations and to renounce their property willingly for the needs of the less-privileged.

Such an atmosphere is being created by the Bhoodan movement. The aim of the movement is not merely to collect land and distribute it among the landless but to bring about a change of heart in human beings, and thereby, free the Indian society from the tentacles of individual acquisitiveness. Of course, the first step towards the establishment of the Sarvodaya order is the creation of a bloodless agrarian revolution, as agriculture is the mainstay of

FRATERNITY OF FREE MEN

Indian economy. The task of ushering in a social revolution on Sarvodaya lines, can be accomplished only by stages. In this non-violent social reconstruction, the Lands Gift Mission is merely a symbol, just as Gandhiji's spinning wheel was emblematic. The Bhoodan symbol stands for the abolition of private property in land, and its proper use by the community. This abolition is to be the signal for the abrogation of all other types of property, that one has, in excess of one's needs. The abolition of private ownership is considered essential, for there is no such thing as a natural right to property. "Property exists," Max Stirner, the German philosopher, maintains, "by grace of the law. It is not a fact, but a legal fiction." Furthermore, the movement proceeds on the presumption that life is to give, and that real happiness lies in giving. Indeed, the moral dictum of Jesus Christ, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive" provides inspiration to the great social experiment.

The extent of poverty being tremendous, Vinobaji has taken up the economic issue first with a view to changing society. He wants that everyone should have enough food, clothing and shelter. Lenin was certainly right when he said: "No amount of political freedom will satisfy the hungry masses." To attain this objective of liberating people from economic servitude, the Sarvodaya movement takes men away from attachment to property, and takes them to the renunciation of property.

CHAPTER EIGHT

STATELESS SOCIETY

The science of government is an experimental science, and like all other experimental sciences, it is generally working itself clearer, and depositing impurity after impurity.

—T. B. MACAULAY

LEADERS of the Sarvodaya movement feel that a socio-economic revolution of the Gandhian conception cannot be engineered by State power. "A peaceful social revolution," Mr. J.P. Narayan says, "is not possible except through a change of heart. Legislation, at best, can legalise a change that has already been brought about." Such being the stand of the votaries of Sarvodaya, the difference between a violent and a non-violent revolution, must be appreciated. A non-violent revolution depends upon mobilising the sanction of the enlightened masses. Therefore, the greatest emphasis is laid on transforming the values and attitudes of the people. On the other hand, in a violent revolution, the State, with the help of its administrative machinery, brings about the revolution, and the people submit to the decrees of the Governmental authority. In Russia, after the overthrow of the Czarist regime, the landlords fled. The peasantry took possession of the land. But, when the State decided to effect an agrarian revolution by collectivising agriculture, the farmers had to give up their property rights. This process to dispossess the "new owners" led to countrywide suffering. Some observers maintain that as many as twenty million people had to be forcibly sent away to Siberia. Other examples of revolutions created by State machinery can also be cited. But the technique of changing society non-violently is entirely a new and novel one which has not so far been tried anywhere in the world. India is the first country witnessing such a silent revolution through the instrumentality of the Bhoodan movement.

Since the State cannot set on foot a non-violent revolution, it is asked : What is the good of developing the supremacy of the State ? The real method of evolving a truly non-violent society, we are told, lies in building the moral strength of the masses. Presuming that through State power, a social system on Sarvodaya lines cannot be established, Vinobaji says : " Our ideal is to build up a society which does not need a coercive authority. The communists also believe that the State will ultimately wither away,

STATELESS SOCIETY

and there will be no need of any coercive authority. For the achievement of that objective, they believe, a centralised authority is necessary to contend with the opposing forces during the transitory stage. Others feel this is a Utopian idea that can never be brought to real life. There are others who take the middle course. They believe that there must remain some sort of Governmental authority. The Government, *i.e.* the coercive authority, is always wanted in society because there are different types of men with different make-up."

II

SUCH being the technique of bringing about a non-violent revolution, the poser is put : Whether an organisation like the Congress engaged in running the Government is really capable of ushering in the Sarvodaya era. In fact, there is a feeling that the Congress cannot do Sarvodaya work and that the Government is making no efforts in working out the new order of Gandhiji's dreams. This feeling tends to create a gap between the Sarvodaya Samaj and the Congress. There is no justification for such a divergence, because the broad social aims and economic objectives of the Sarvodaya Samaj and of the Congress, are almost identical. The chiefs of both the organisations are outstanding men of sincerity and selflessness. Their life and work is a shining example of nobility. The future of the Congress, its leaders know, is interlinked with the success that the Sarvodaya movement achieves. That is why the Congress has been paying glowing tributes to Vinobaji, and calling upon the people to contribute to Bhoodan.

As regards the means to be adopted in establishing the new social order based on equity and equality, there is unanimity between the Sarva Seva Sangh and the Congress. Stating the position of the Congress, Mr. U. N. Dhebar says : " We all accept that for the achievement of our objectives, we should adopt pure means. I have no hesitation in saying that if ever this Congress organisation leaves considerations of pure means for the achievement of its object, it will be a sad day for the nation." Refuting the criticism, that the Congress cannot do Sarvodaya work, the Congress President asserts that "the Congress approach to problems on the whole is on the Sarvodaya pattern. The Congress has decided to act in that manner."

III

BUT, on the question of having a Stateless society, a noticeable

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

difference of opinion exists between the Samaj and the Congress. The existence of the State is justified, because without the active help of the State, the material well-being of the people cannot be adequately provided for. Moreover, as Mr. Issac Foot, in the House of Commons, once said : "Great as freedom may be, it has to rest upon a basis of Government." The State alone can do planning, and the great results that the First Five-Year Plan has yielded, indubitably proves the necessity of national planning. Nevertheless, that does not mean that the people should completely depend upon the State for their social uplift and economic emancipation. The masses must move forward, irrespective of the attitude and action of the administration. The relationship between the people and the Government is one that of an integrated social purpose. People's initiative makes the official schemes of national reconstruction doubly effective and the Government's plans give a ready opportunity to the people to utilize their energy. It is a recognised fact that a democratic form of government is the finest social instrument for harnessing the creative urges and immanent talents of the people. Mr. Walt Whitman, the celebrated poet, in *Democratic Vistas*, says : "Political democracy with all its threatening evils, supplies a training school for making first-class men." The Sarvodaya ideal of "enlightened mass power" is being realised through the welfare activities of the State. The State having become a necessary adjunct of our lives, people look towards it for help, and the State drawing its inspiration from the people, gives all the assistance that the people need. Hence, the contention that a Sarvodaya social system will only come into being when the State "withers away" is hardly tenable. Vinobaji himself admits that "in a non-violent society also the coercive authority will be there but the chief thing is that in such a society, organisation based on service, will have the most prominent place." But, the Congress too, stands for the decentralisation of economic and political power on the broadest possible basis, and the service of the people is its cardinal principle.

Thinking dispassionately, one arrives at the conclusion, that the Sarvodaya ideal of a Stateless society with "limited functions" and the Congress objective of a decentralised administration, are two sides of the same coin. And if there is any variance in the view point, it is merely a question of emphasis on the extent of power that the State should possess.

IV

THERE is another question which has been the subject of a good deal of debate. And that is : What role should non-violence play in ushering in the new social order ? It is rather unfortunate that

after the passing away of Gandhiji, a certain difference of opinion has arisen in respect of the true meaning and real purpose of his message of non-violence. The votaries of the Sarvodaya Samaj swear by non-violence, and so do the leaders of the Congress. Yet Vinobaji feels that "while *ahimsa* was Gandhiji's life breath, to-day there was an official version of non-violence and to cause the least inconvenience or ill-will seemed to be their criterion of non-violence." It is asked: If the Congress really puts its faith in non-violence, then how does it justify the maintenance of an army at such a huge expense? This inconsistency is more apparent than real. In his personal life, Gandhiji practised non-violence to such an extreme that the people could scarcely believe it. But all the same, he made it absolutely clear that unadulterated *ahimsa* was an ideal which very few could accomplish. What mattered, he said, was not the attainment of the ideal but the continuous striving towards it. Such a liberal approach has been commended by saints and philosophers since times immemorial. The reason is provided by Mr. Theodore Parker when he tells us that "all men need something to poetize and idealize their life a little—something which they value far more than its use, and which is a symbol of their emancipation from the mere materialism and drab drudgery of daily life."

It may not be out of place to mention that Gandhiji had also said that violence was better than cowardice. In other words, any person who had not developed the non-violent strength to fight injustice, or any social evil, should resist it with force rather than surrender. His non-violence also did not stand in the way of approving the Indian Government's decision to send troops to Kashmir, in response to an appeal by the Kashmir State, when the valley was raided by trans-frontier marauders. In his personal life, he refused to compromise with the principle of non-violence. Still, while applying the same principle to national spheres, he did not push it to its logical end, for that would have meant sacrificing the spirit for the letter. That is why Gandhiji, in spite of his high idealism, was not a mystic but a realist.

From this liberal attitude of the Master, it is evident that the inconsistency between the Congress profession and practice of non-violence, is only superficial. Leaders of the Sarvodaya Samaj and the Congress, in their own fields of work, are spreading the message of non-violence. Both in running the administration of the country and in the international sphere, Nehru is giving a practical shape to Gandhiji's teachings to a far greater extent than anybody else. The prophetic words of Gandhiji that "when I am gone he will speak my language" have come true. Non-violence stands for peace in the world and Nehru's role in maintaining peace, in face of worldwide

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

preparations for war, is certainly unique. Millions of families the world over, pray for the success of his mission to make the world realise that non-violence alone can save humanity from utter destruction. The meaningful words of Napoleon should be heeded by the Big Powers. In the solitude of St. Helena, the fallen Emperor had said : " Alexander, Caesar, Charlemagne and myself have founded empires ; but upon what do these creations of our genius depend ? Upon force. Jesus alone founded His empire upon love ; and to this very day millions would die for Him."

CHAPTER NINE

THE PURPOSE OF PLANNING

It really is of importance, not only what men do, but also what manner of men they are that do it. Among the works of man, which human life is rightly employed in perfecting and beautifying, the first in importance surely is man himself.

—JOHN STUART MILL: ON LIBERTY

A WELFARE STATE is an integral part of a socialist society. But a Welfare State, by itself, need not be of a socialistic pattern. A Welfare State is usually preoccupied with maintaining a respectable average standard of living, and the per capita income serves as the yardstick of social progress. A socialist society is also concerned with the average economic conditions of the people. Still, along with that, the maxima and the minima of wealth possessions are not allowed to exist beyond a reasonable extent. A Welfare State does not worry about income disparities, if the economic average is satisfactory. Countries, like America and England, are having Welfare States of a very high order. They have provided social services, and even guaranteed social security to their people, without following socialism. But we in India, for good many reasons, have decided to have a Welfare State based on a socialised economy. The most important reason for having chosen the twofold objective is that in an under-developed country which suffers from a dwarfed economy, the pitiable living conditions of the people can only be improved through the mechanism of planning. Obviously, mere declaration of objectives, however high and noble they may be, cannot by themselves bring about any social changes. Programmes, well-defined and specific in character, have to be chalked out in conformity with the felt needs and requirements of the community. And proper planning is only feasible if the broad principles of socialism provide inspiration to the formulation of State policy. Again, purposeful planning is essential if social disparities and economic inequalities are to be removed with a view to creating the groundwork of an egalitarian society. This realisation has made a large number of people plan-conscious. Even though they may not be experts in social thought, or have a specialised knowledge of economic affairs, they have started thinking about planning, and taking interest in its meaning and purpose.

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

It will not be an exaggeration to say that the word "planning" in free India has become as familiar with the people as the word "Swaraj" in the days of slavery. This is logical because the social purposes of our struggle for freedom can only be realised through the process of planning. The urges and aspirations of the people to attain economic freedom, without which political freedom has not much value, have to be harnessed for constructive activities, lest they direct themselves into wrong channels and threaten the very integrity of the nation. "It is futile to expect a hungry and squalid population," declares T.H. Huxley, "to be anything but violent and gross." The Government also realises that democracy, as an institution for preserving liberty of thought and human dignity, cannot be built on foundations laid by disgruntled minds and empty stomachs. Lenin was right when he said: "Political institutions are a superstructure resting on an economic foundation." As a matter of fact, since the passing of the Avadi Resolution on the ideal of a socialistic pattern of society, which has not only clarified the social objectives of planning, but has also defined them in precise terms, and thereby provided a clear-cut concept of the new order, there has been a vital change in the mental attitude of the people. They have been devoting more time to the economic plane than to the purely political plane. This is a welcome development which augurs well for the nation. Indeed, this shift in public thinking is a significant sign of the dynamism of our times. It must be said to the credit of our planners that the unprecedented success of the First Five-Year Plan has also made the people realise that prosperity can be achieved only through planning. This new outlook is an important contribution to the needs of resurgent India. It also shows the rapid growth of maturity in the nation. People are no longer passive observers of Governmental activities, but intelligent and active participants in the making of social policies pursued in the States. There is a growing realisation of the magnitude of the problems ahead, and the determination to tackle them is evident all over. A spirit of self-confidence and self-reliance, which emanates from the performance of great tasks has grown among the people. The present social enthusiasm and faith in common endeavour is creating a fraternity about which Mr. M.N. Roy had dreamt in his book *Reason, Romanticism and Revolution*. His vision was that of "a brotherhood of men attracted by the adventure of ideas, keenly conscious of the urge for freedom, fired by the vision of a free society of free men, and motivated by the will to remake the world, so as to restore the individual to his position of primacy and dignity."

II

SOCIALISM is not something which can be imposed by the Government. Having an organic relationship with the day-to-day lives of the people, it has to develop in the social fabric. People's thinking in terms of planning, for achieving social objectives, helps them to grow into socialism. The new social kinship that planning brings about, finds roots deep in the minds of the people. And out of these roots springs a social system, harmonious in character and possessing vitality which comes from orderly human evolution. And evolution, Lord Morley, the distinguished statesman, once said, "is not a force but a process."

The recognition of planning, as an instrument of social progress, is also due to the fact that many Western countries, which built up their material prosperity on the basis of an unbridled free economy, have now to face the situation that unless some checks are exercised over their economic system, it might tumble down, because the former colonies no longer exist to dump their goods, due to national awakening in Asia, Africa and Latin American countries. All this must serve as a lesson to us that we should not plan our economic development with an eye on foreign markets for the export of our products but, as Mr. G. B. Pant, the Union Home Minister, has put it, "on the basis of maximum national self-sufficiency."

Over-production by itself is no measure of social advance, unless venues of consumption are simultaneously created. As a matter of fact, Ruskin in his book *Unto This Last* maintains that "consumption is the crown of production, and the wealth of a nation is only to be estimated by what it consumes." Of course, there is no such thing as absolutism in over-production. It is a relative term, for it is linked with consumption. The yardstick to measure over-production must, therefore, differ from one country to the other. Excessive production, unaccompanied by appropriate consumption, means heading towards depression. Unless the malady is arrested in time, the country will be thrown into the chaos of unemployment, and consequently, the nation will find itself swamped by social misery.

It is because of the fear of such an economic crisis that countries, which had been the strong champions of giving a free hand to private enterprise, now feel that some kind of planning—even though they do not subscribe to the doctrine of national planning—is inevitable for systematic progress. In fact, the advanced countries have realised that planning alone can act as a stabilizer between the agricultural and industrial sectors and that lop-sided economic development which obstructs the fulfilment of social ends can only be arrested through State controls. That is why Harold Laski,

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

in *Plan or Perish*, warns that "it would be madness to let the purposes, or the methods of private enterprise, set the habits of the age of atomic energy." Moreover, the institution of planning has gained in status because of its success in transforming a backward and feudalistic country like Russia into a modern and industrially advanced nation.

III

THE true purpose of planning is not merely to lay down targets for agricultural and industrial production, although they are the essential features of planning. The wider aim is to transform the social and economic life of the country by eliminating the evil of exploitation and providing equal opportunities to all. In this manner, social distinctions will be removed and appropriate conditions for the material, cultural and moral progress of the entire society created.

India is the first under-developed country to plan for economic development with the full consciousness that something more is needed for the well-being of the individual and the community than mere achievement of progress in the agricultural and industrial sectors. The outstanding distinctiveness of India's economic planning lies in the fact that no other country with such a vast population has ever tried planning on socialistic lines, and that too, within the democratic framework of the Constitution. Therefore, it has to be constantly watched, that all the steps taken in the process of social regeneration, are in conformity with the Directive Principles of State Policy. It should also be borne in mind that the goal to be reached is that of a socialistic society in which individual initiative is adequately guaranteed and personal liberty properly preserved, to ensure a balanced growth of human personality. The raising of the moral stature of man is a social necessity, because as Emerson wrote in *Society and Solitude*, "the true test of civilization is, not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—no, but the kind of men the country turns out."

The allocation of resources, laying down of reconstruction programmes, fixation of priorities and drawing up of welfare schemes, all have to be determined in consonance with the objectives of our social policy. In all spheres of economic development and social uplift, only one priority should have the governing influence, and that priority is, the establishment of the new equalitarian society. For that reason, the Planning Commission has emphatically stated that "the central objective of planning is to initiate a process of development which will raise living standards, and open out to the people new opportunities for a richer and more varied life." If

THE PURPOSE OF PLANNING

the ideal, that planning is for the sake of men and not men for the sake of planning, is not faithfully adhered to, planning however scientific in its formulation, and efficient in its productive aspects, is sure to produce new social ill-effects. This will happen because there will be a constant tendency to confuse economic programmes with social objectives, and also to sacrifice the fundamental aim of transforming the social system, at the altar of reaching some specific targets. In that case, the appraisal of *The Communist Manifesto* as the "chaos of programme and methods" by the French socialist, Mr. Jean Jaures, will in some measure apply to our planning as well. Keeping all these things in view, the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan emphatically states that "economic objectives cannot be divorced from social objectives and means and objectives go together."

All this clearly shows that planning has a much higher purpose than merely raising the living conditions of the people. In fact, Mr. V. T. Krishnamachari, Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, says: "It is the embodiment of the will of the nation to rebuild itself." Many European States have succeeded in improving their standard of living without committing themselves to the cult of economic planning and the socialist ideal. But India has adopted planning on socialistic lines as a part of State policy because the national aim is to reconstruct society with a view to providing social equality and economic freedom to all the 360 millions. In view of the fact that planning aims at uplifting society as a whole, special attention has to be paid to the development of backward areas "where communications are poor, where climate or other conditions are unfavourable, where the economy is largely unmonetised, agriculture is insecure, the standard of living is low, or which are inhabited by aborigines, or other similar classes," to bring them up to the common social level. This strategy ensures an all-India social action at a certain speed. Consequently, the country as a well-knit social unit progresses in a harmonious manner. Moreover, in a vast country like India, regional approach in planning has an importance of its own which needs no stressing. Therefore, general ideas in order to become significant, have to be adjusted to suit local conditions. Along with that, the felt needs of the poorest sections of the community, whether in big cities, or in the far-flung small villages, must be satisfied so that the glow of economic emancipation touches their lives. Emphasising the social urgency of raising the status of the poorest sections, President Roosevelt in his Second Inaugural Address said: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little." Unless the requirements of the most neglected regions and

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

the most needy strata of society are given topmost priority in our programmes of national reconstruction, the goal of the new social order will just not be reached. Prof. Shriman Narayan, the talented exponent of Gandhian philosophy, rightly says that "the philosophy of 'unto this last' should underlie all our plans and projects," and "the last should become the first in our priorities of planning." Of course, planning should also aim at "levelling down" those classes who have been enriching themselves by exploiting the down-trodden masses, because the quintessence of economic freedom is economic equality and reduction of glaring economic disparities. In short, a socialistic pattern of society can only be established if the task of "levelling up" the lowliest, and the "levelling down" of the richest, is pursued in a crusading spirit. The atmosphere for lowering down the extravagantly rich has been well created, as the upper classes like King Canute of the olden days, have realised that they just cannot stem the tide of the new social order. It is this consciousness, than a resurrection of faith in the social theories of Bentham and Mill, that have made them reconcile to the changing pattern of social values.

CHAPTER TEN

THE PROBLEM OF PRIORITIES

Tzu-kung asked, What is kingcraft?

The Master said: "Food enough, troops enough and a trusting people."

Tzu-kung said: "Were there no help for it, which could best be spared of the three?"

"Troops," said the Master.

"And were there no help for it, which could better be spared of the other two?"

"Food," said the Master. "From of old men all die, but without trust a people cannot stand."

—THE SAYINGS OF CONFUCIUS

IN an under-developed country, the planner is faced with a dilemma in fixing priorities for social and economic uplift. The material and technical resources of a backward country—because of its persistent low development—are limited, but the wants of the common folk are great in number, and of an urgent character. Education has to be imparted to change the values and attitudes of the people; in the words of Lenin, "without it there are only rumours, gossip, fables and prejudices." Roads have to be built to link the villages with the cities to facilitate social communication and commercial transport. Medical facilities must be provided to banish disease and better the health of the people. Canals have to be constructed to irrigate fallow lands. Industries must be started to increase production and to give employment to the jobless, and to eradicate social indigence as well, because poverty, as Aristotle said in *Politics*, is "the parent of revolution and crime." Above all, a network of welfare services has to be laid to improve the social standards of the community.

All these things, which have an urgency of their own, present a baffling problem. And it is simply cruel to sermonise on the high qualities of patience to the people who for long have been living under sub-human conditions; to explain the benefits of gradualism to them is nothing short of ridiculing their just and legitimate aspirations. Of course, we cannot adopt reckless methods, for they will bring little social good. The danger

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

is that they may actually do harm. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of drastic methods, they at best, result in equalisation at the lowest stage of poverty. Distribution of poverty is certainly not the aim of the new socialistic society we conceive of. The complexity of the problem cannot be solved by any predetermined theory of social action, because the task of national development is not a mechanical one. Nor can the dilemma be resolved by any set dogma. The problem is essentially human, affecting the day-to-day lives of 360 million people and, consequently, is vast in magnitude and intricate in character. For the benefit of academicians, Carlyle appropriately laid down that "one should honour facts more and more, and theory less and less." The neglect of one side, in preference to the other, creates a lop-sided development. Hence, the ideal of balancing social progress in its totality, cannot be achieved. The only answer to this puzzling question of fixing priorities is to start work simultaneously on all the fronts of social and economic regeneration, and have a physical approach to planning.

II

IN simple terms, physical approach to planning means that its motive force springs from the felt needs of the people, and is based on the resources available. This approach is apt, as social development cannot be dynamic unless it is co-related to the basic needs of the masses. Targets are fixed on that basis and not on actual finances. In this way, planning becomes real and the urgent wants of the community can be satisfied in an adequate manner, and a reasonable rise in the living conditions of the people brought about, without depending too much on financial resources. Thus, planning on a physical level ensures refreshing freedom from the rigid bond of orthodox economics.

If planning were to be undertaken on the consideration of finances alone—they being very limited—the plan would necessarily be of a restricted character, and the pace of economic development would be slow and halting. How small are the fiscal resources of India can be judged from the fact that while our annual revenue is about Rs. 450 crores only, the United Kingdom—one twelfth in size and having one sixth of India's population—has a monthly revenue of over Rs. 500 crores. Of course, in industrially advanced countries, financial planning by itself, can produce big results because of the abundance of funds, high technological equipment and scientific knowledge. But physical planning should not be considered a magic formula which will cure all the maladies in the economic system. True planning

THE PROBLEM OF PRIORITIES

must take all resources, financial and otherwise, into consideration, while preparing programmes and fixing priorities. The reason being that inasmuch as physical targets of production, however essential for the good of the community will not be achieved, unless they are based on the system of prices and costs, and are also balanced in terms of money. Purely from the theoretical point of view many economists hold that allocation of resources in terms of prices is not possible in a socialist economy as all factors of production and distribution are owned by the State. Von Mises, the well-known Austrian economist, maintains that because of this difficulty, socialism is not a workable proposition. There is some truth in such a viewpoint, because free market not being there, economic calculations on price basis become difficult. But Oscar Lange, Member Polish Planning Commission, has proved the fallacy of this exaggerated presumption, for he says: "Both in theory and in practice a rational allocation is possible in a socialist society on the basis of accounting price or provisional valuations."

So it will not be wrong to say that there is no inherent conflict between physical and financial planning and the two are complementary to each other. Even Prof. P.C. Mahalanobis, who is a great advocate of physical approach to planning, feels that "physical and financial planning are different aspects of the same reality." In a way, true planning is neither a fiscal nor a physical problem; it is a psychological one. The reason being that unless a receptive psychology is created, the allocation of financial and real resources will not very much help in the realisation of national objectives. In fact, economic reconstruction of an under-developed country is a social process which involves many things, more vital and of an enduring nature, than the mere erection of factories and the building of dams. It is the inculcation of an economic and social philosophy that goes a long way in making the plan a success.

Although physical approach makes planning comprehensive and its scope is widened, the burden of implementing it also becomes greater. The real resources have to be allocated in a rational way and the statistical information about these resources must be as accurate as possible. Emphasising the necessity of having a realistic approach to social problems, Julian Huxley, in his *Essays in Popular Science*, writes: "To speculate without facts is to attempt to enter a house of which one has not the key, by wandering aimlessly round and round, searching the walls and now and then peeping through the windows. Facts are the key." Of course, in a backward country like India, the collection of statistical data and systematic knowledge on a scientific basis is not an easy task. But it is heartening to note that statistical information, due to the efforts of the Planning Commission and State Governments, has grown and is growing. Accordingly, planning

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

with a physical bias has to be flexible and capable of improvement as more data is gathered and fresh experience gained. Moreover, social ideas of the people change and so do their needs. Above all the changing pattern of political forces has to be reckoned with. From the political point of view also a certain amount of elasticity to cope with shifts in public thinking becomes the prerequisite of economic planning. Finality in a purposeful plan is difficult to conceive. Indeed, physical planning is a live process, for it is based on human needs and interlinked with local means. The moment one problem is solved, others raise their heads and need solution. In a progressive society, planning must adjust itself to new situations. Predetermination is bound to act as a hindrance in the march towards the new order, as rigid planning does not help in integrating people's emotions with State policies.

III

INASMUCH as in a physical plan, financial resources play a secondary part, its success mainly depends on the enthusiasm that it arouses among the people. Physical planning requires a tremendous amount of co-operative effort on the part of the masses to organise work of social reconstruction, and thereby, depend the least on capital resources which come from the usual methods of saving and investment. In this way, the Government gets considerable freedom to utilise a large part of the nation's savings to build up the heavy industries base. Therefore, it is of paramount importance that the people should be associated to the maximum extent with the formulation of a plan, to make it a worthy medium of social regeneration. Naturally, this association will give them the sensation that the plan is their own. And knowing that it has been formulated, in accordance with their requirements, they will feel that it is for their own good. In case, any difficulty arises in its actual implementation, they will bear the burdens gladly, because having participated in its preparation, they will be in a mood to discharge their special duties. This sense of social responsibility will dynamise their outlook, and the urgent need for new men to bring about the new socialistic pattern of society will be amply fulfilled. Such being the power of popular association, Woodrow Wilson once said: "I believe in democracy as it releases the energy of every human being." Further, the experience gained by the people in working for the common good will also be utilised by them in solving their day-to-day problems. In fact, out of people's initiative and independent thinking, would emerge local leadership, and the democratic base in the country, would consequently become broad and strong.

THE PROBLEM OF PRIORITIES

Efforts of the Government cannot by themselves lead to prosperity unless the wisdom and energy of the whole nation is mobilised, both in the formulation and execution of the plan. Therefore, the simple, yet meaningful Chinese saying, that "if you are planning for one year, plant grains ; if you are planning for ten years plant trees ; if you are planning for a hundred years, plant men," should serve as a constant reminder to our planners. Indeed, this saying is the key to planning for posterity.

The high importance that Nehru attaches to people's participation in all State efforts becomes evident from his memorable words ringing with sincerity—words that come from an instinctive passion for service, and an irresistible love for humanity. Speaking a year back, at a mammoth meeting in Madras, he said : "I want to talk to the people privately and confidentially about the various problems. I have a feeling that we can only go ahead if all of us understand each other and march forward together. I have hardly any ambition left. I have been a very ambitious person in many ways. But I do not know if I can now call myself ambitious in the normal sense of the word. However, there is one ambition left in me and it is this : that in the years to come and in the few years left to me, I should throw myself with all the strength and energy left in me, into the work of building up India. I want to do it to the uttermost, till I am exhausted and thrown away on the scrap heap. I am not interested in what you, or anybody else may think of me afterwards. It is enough for me that I have exhausted myself, my strength and my energy, in India's task . . . I do not care what happens to my reputation after I am gone. But if any people choose to think of me then, I should like them to say : 'This was a man who with all his mind and heart, loved India and the Indian people. And they all, in turn, were indulgent to him, and gave him of their love, most abundantly and extravagantly.'"

It is said that since planning is a specialised subject, and scientific knowledge, modern technology and centralised administration are its prerequisites, too much decentralisation in the preparation and implementation of a plan, will create a host of administrative problems and other complications. A democratic procedure and popular association, may create some difficulties for the State executive. But, as the American political leader, Mr. Alfred Smith, has said : "All the ills of democracy can be cured by more democracy." And, in view of the fact, that the objective of planning in India is not merely to raise economic standards, but to reorganise the entire social structure with the object of establishing a socialistic society, planning from below is most essential. Decentralisation of democracy and economic organisation, is not only imperative from the standpoint of

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

political ideology but a condition precedent to providing gainful employment to the millions of idle hands. Not by stinting democracy, but by enlarging and enriching it, can one make it the spark plug of economic development.

The Planning Commission attaches so much importance to building from bottom upwards that in the Second Plan it wants "to ensure that (i) every family has a plan for which it works, including agricultural production and subsidiary occupations ; (ii) every family is made eligible to become a member of at least one co-operative society ; (iii) every family devotes a portion of its time and resources for the benefit of the community." Again, every family, in its efforts to improve its social status, is to be given full assistance. Thus, the significance of planning lies in, as to in what measure, it enables the family unit to uplift itself, than in the fact of what may be accomplished in the various fields of production. Through planning from bottom upwards, the conflict between centralisation, which is inherent in planning, and the preservation of democracy by utilising local initiative, can be reconciled. Such a human process of decentralised planning alone, can spread the message of the new social order in every corner of the land. That by itself will be an achievement worthy of giants. The cheering vision of better days to come will electrify the minds of millions. And once the tremendous base of the Indian population is activated, social effort in the country will gather speed. Consequently, the shining goal of the new order will draw nearer and nearer, spreading its light to the dingy huts of the countryside, and in the filthy slums of big cities, where men and women are huddled together like cattle.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

HOPE FOR HUMANITY

*Thou, too, sail on, O Ship of State !
Sail on, O Union, strong and great !
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate !*

—H.W. LONGFELLOW : BUILDING OF THE SHIP

THE First Five-Year Plan, in a sense, was superimposed by the administration, because the primary impulse and initiative rested with the Government. It was conceived in New Delhi, and the people at large, were not taken into confidence. The planners themselves were conscious of this short-coming, and feared that popular support might not be forthcoming, as the inspiration of the masses had not been evoked during the formulation of the Plan. That is why they laid down that the Plan should be worked democratically and warned the administration that "projects of such significance to the economy of the country and involving financial outlay of such magnitude, as are now contemplated in the First Five-Year Plan, cannot be implemented successfully, unless the State could arouse mass enthusiasm and secure public support on a nation-wide scale."

Why was not the democratic course of consulting the people, while preparing the First Plan, followed? The answer is simple. The problems that faced the country, as a result of the war and partition, were of such a pressing nature that they required immediate attention and quick solution. The economy had to be rescued from the stranglehold of the food crisis. In fact, the country found itself caught in the vicious circle of Malthusian dilemma. Inflation had to be fought to save the common man from the crushing burden of soaring prices. Production of ordinary consumer goods had to be increased to satisfy the basic necessities of life. The general disequilibrium in the structure of national economy, due to the acute shortage of raw materials and unbalanced foreign trade, had to be restored. Moreover, both the Central and the State Governments had been drawing up their reconstruction schemes since 1947, although they were not, by any means, integrated plans framed on the basis of a comprehensive knowledge of the real resources of the country. Consequently, the Planning Commission had to function within the

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

limits of the decisions already taken by the Central and State Governments. This can be seen from the fact that nearly half of the expenditure earmarked in the First Plan for projects related to those projects which had already been started. As such, the First Plan was, in a way, a conglomeration of public works and irrigation projects, whose economic effects did not call for precise appraisal, because the main object was not to balance the various activities of the nation in terms of social objectives, but to make up shortages and fill up the cavities in the economic structure. This approach helped in taking out the country from the whirlpool of a scarcity psychosis. Even though, the achievements have been mostly of a negative character, the special stress on agriculture and food production, succeeded in providing a strong agricultural base to build up the edifice of mechanised industry. It has also given stability to the Indian economy and paved the way for rapid and orderly advance in the future. Therefore, the First Plan, in spite of its many limitations, handicaps and short-comings, is to be regarded as the foundation of all the future plans. The First Plan was the first step forward, and as Voltaire has said: "It is the first step on which depends the rest of our days."

It must also be mentioned that the phenomenal rise in industrial production has enabled the people to meet their day-to-day requirements which they were unable to do in the past years. This helped in easing social tension, because an unsatisfied want, to quote Mr. Hannah Cohen from *Changing Faces*, "is like a bent bow, pressing always, pointing always, and never asleep." It has been authoritatively stated that India has recorded the most balanced and efficient economic development in South East Asia. But the most welcome feature of the Plan has been the emergence of unbounded enthusiasm among the people. Their contributions, both in terms of money and labour, have surprised even the biggest optimists. People are making sacrifices as they do in the days of war to preserve their political freedom. This is so, as war against poverty and unemployment is on to win economic freedom, without which political freedom itself is not of much value. This mass awakening, under the stimulus of recreating their lives and rebuilding India, with a view to providing social justice to one and all, has generated dynamic forces in the country. The atmosphere is surcharged with new hopes, new desires and new aspirations. Fatalism, the inevitable curse of all subjugation, is fast disappearing and people are determined to reach the destination of prosperity. In fact, the tempo of expectation is fast increasing in the country, whose challenge must be met in a manner worthy of the high ideals, which we have set before ourselves. Only bold planning, conceived in a big way, and comprehensive in its scope, with

HOPE FOR HUMANITY

provisions for rapid social changes, will make it possible to utilise the new-born energies of the people to reconstruct the social system on an equalitarian base.

II

THE Second Five-Year Plan—because it takes into consideration the felt needs of the masses, and is formulated on a physical level and has clear-cut social objectives to achieve—provides an appropriate medium to mobilise the creative urges of the people and harness the country's resources, to bring about substantial transformation in the social and economic life of the masses. Since the governing needs of the ordinary people are the controlling factor in drawing up the Second Plan, it is a Plan of the common man. This emphasis on making an individual the central point of national reconstruction is essential, because man, as Protagoras, the Greek philosopher, once said, is the measure of all things.

The success of the Second Plan will be judged not so much by the fulfilment of the targets, but by the changes it produces in the social structure, and the way in which it takes the nation nearer the goal of the proposed socialistic order. It is big, not merely because it aims at an expenditure nearly three times the investment under the First Plan, but it is bigger and bolder in the sense that it expects huge sacrifices from the nation and popular co-operation on a tremendous scale. The orthodox belief, that democratic planning means timid planning, is born of a lack of faith in the wisdom and capacity of the people. The words of Jefferson, uttered as far back as 1801, that "it is rare that the public sentiment decides immorally or unwisely, and the individual who differs from it ought to distrust and examine well his own opinion," should be remembered by those who doubt democracy. The Prime Minister's assurance that through the instrumentality of the Second Plan, the country will be speedily taken towards the socialistic pattern of society, has created the necessary social environment for voluntary effort and willing sacrifice. Moreover, the atmosphere for planning to-day is more favourable than it was at the time of the First Plan, when the very idea of planning was not appreciated by the people at large. Now everybody accepts planning, although there may be a difference of opinion in respect of the methods and manner of planning.

III

THE broad objective of the Second Plan is the ushering in of the

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

new social order, as the nation's declaration favouring a socialistic pattern, has a decisive influence on the approach and tone of the Plan. Its narrower objectives are :

1. A sizeable increase (about 25 per cent.) in the national income so as to raise the level of living in the country.
2. Rapid industrialisation with special emphasis on key industries to produce capital goods, so that light industries may be started with tools and equipment manufactured within the country.
3. Expansion of the public sector, and over-all strategic control over private means of production to ensure that the "ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed, as best to serve the common good," and that "the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment."
4. Fuller employment through household and medium-sized industries to increase production of consumer goods, and at the same time augment the purchasing power of the masses.

IV

EACH one of these objectives, taken singly, may not be so difficult to accomplish. But, a simultaneous advance on all the four fronts must be made to recreate a cohesive economy and ensure all-round social progress. Then alone, the new socialistic aspirations will be translated into reality. That certainly makes the Second Plan a complicated affair. Mass production by itself will not improve the living conditions of the people unless it is well integrated with mass consumption, so as to balance demand and supply. That is only possible if the purchasing power of the people is enlarged, which means creating new employment opportunities. But to facilitate employment, there should be enough capital formation, which brings in the question of saving. And saving is only feasible if people are gainfully employed and have a little extra after satisfying their day-to-day needs. But the number of the unemployed is a legion and the wants of the people are vast in number and of a diverse character. Moreover, if consumption is reduced to mobilise savings, not only will the living conditions of the people remain as pitiable as before, but increased production will not be properly utilised. And over-production means bringing down prices which will result in a slump and the creation of new social problems in the form of unemployment. The incentive for production in the

HOPE FOR HUMANITY

form of profit expectations not being there, the factories shall have either to close down, or reduce the number of hands working previously. Not only that, but the demand for raw materials will slacken which will hit the agriculturists adversely. And if the vast agricultural base shakes, the entire economy of India will tumble down. Summing up, it may be stated that the question of full employment, the problem of production and consumption, and the technique of effecting savings, are all inter-related factors.

All this shows, how intricate and involved, is the work that has been undertaken in the Second Plan. A vicious circle has come to stay as a result of the continuous low development. The breaking of this circle with a view to rejuvenating the decadent Indian economy is, no doubt, a task which requires mature thinking and planned strategy. The difficulties enumerated above are only in relation to the economic aspect of planning. When they are considered in the perspective of integrating economic activities with the network of social services, the magnitude of efforts needed in implementing the Second Plan can be better gauged. But, the harder the task the nobler is the call. The pledge of the nation to eradicate misery, idleness and disease within the next two decades presents a mighty challenge, which India, under the leadership of Nehru has decided to meet with humility, faith and determination. Out of this challenge will emerge a truly just and humane order, for politics to Indian leaders does not merely mean the science of orderly governance, but "the art of human happiness," as defined by Herbert Fischer in his *History of Europe*.

CHAPTER TWELVE

EQUILIBRIUM IN ECONOMICS

In everything the middle course is best: all things in excess bring trouble to men.

—PLAUTUS

A PURE economy in its broad conception can be split up into two categories. In the first type, private enterprise has the fullest freedom to function, and in the second type the entire economic organisation is controlled by the State. A combination of the two categories of pure economy has come to be known as a mixed economy. When thoroughly planned by the State with the object of ending economic injustice, capitalist economy becomes a mixed economy. Since in our declaration to establish a socialistic society we have not accepted the monolithic pattern of political and economic technique, mixed economy becomes the inevitable instrument for reconstructing the present social system on egalitarian lines.

Economic co-existence at home is the logical counterpart of the philosophy of co-existence abroad. Purposeful unison in domestic and foreign policy is a political necessity. "Domestic policy and foreign policy," Prof. Arnold Tonybee, the celebrated historian, rightly says, "cannot be kept in separate water-tight compartments now-a-days." In the international sphere, the principle of co-existence has contributed much to the creation of peace and harmony. In the national field, the same principle of co-existence between different sectors of economy is applied through mutual understanding and spirit of tolerance, so that a balanced and uniform social progress is assured. Moreover, as recently pointed out by Mr. Norman Thomas in *New Leader*, "it is of utmost importance for democratic socialism to proclaim its conviction that free men in fellowship can plan effectively, that such planning does not require a totalitarian State, that it will fare best under a mixed economy, giving scope to many of the varied incentives which make men work."

The doctrine of *laissez-faire* stands discredited, for the reason, that not only does it create social and economic disparities, but it also endangers the very bread of the common people through their systematic exploitation. In a society which is ruled by the philosophy of *laissez-faire*, social wastes in all fields are tremendous. That explains why Ruskin laid down that "the man who accepts

EQUILIBRIUM IN ECONOMICS

the *laissez-faire* doctrine would allow his garden to run wild, so that the roses might fight it out with the weeds, and the fittest might survive." As regards the collectivist method of controlling the country's economy, it is grossly disadvantageous, for in addition to obliterating individual economic initiative, it hastens political freedom to its grave. Gandhiji's abhorrence of the collectivist technique of managing national affairs was so great that he said: "I look upon an increase of the power of the State with the greatest fear, because although while apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality, which lies at the root of all progress." Therefore, the twofold objective of our social policy *i.e.* promoting economic welfare and preserving democracy, can best be achieved by affecting a harmonious blend of the conflicting claims of private initiative and State controls. If some restraint is put on individual enterprise, it should not be considered as an assault on personal freedom; such restraint is essential to extend social protection to the underprivileged. Those on whom it is imposed, should regard it as a part of their social obligation to the community. In fact, liberty is not something absolute which can endure in isolation; it is a co-related social concept which must adjust itself to the needs of society. Even a liberal democrat like Daniel Webster, over a century ago, had declared that "liberty exists in proportion to wholesome restraint."

Willing acceptance of the curtailment in certain economic rights strengthens the cause of democracy. Absolute economic freedom is certainly not the only source of political freedom. Indeed, certain control over economic liberty is imperative for the preservation of political freedom. Discussing the inter-relationship between social obligations of the State and individual rights, Prof. J. H. Muirhead, in his book *The Service of the State*, says: "Liberty is no fixed quantity which necessarily diminishes as corporate control increases." Democracy in which social injustice prevails, is neither democracy, nor it can last long. Therefore, a reasonable control over economic activity advances the cause of social justice and at the same time revitalises democracy itself. That is why in *Men and Politics*, Mr. Louis Fischer maintains that "society to-day needs an economy of checks and balances, one in which the State can check private capital, in which private capital can balance the State and in which citizens organised as consumers or as producers, with little or no property, can check and balance both the State and capital."

II

FOR the last few decades, the term "mixed economy" has been

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

gaining in popularity in the modern economic thought. Although mixed economy has arisen in status during recent times, the State, since its origin, has been taking part in organising some sections of the economic system. In olden days, the kings, and even feudal chiefs, used to set up units of production to manufacture war material. They also constructed highways and built minor irrigation projects. All these things were done, however, not with the object of planning an orderly development of the economic life, but because they were in a large measure essential for the proper governance of the land. Hence, such economies, notwithstanding their mixed pattern, were not mixed economies in the real sense but were haphazard mixtures of the two pure economies. Moreover, the State's participation in the economic life was not motivated by any social ideals. But now mixed economy is a well designed and properly planned social technique. It has set social purposes to achieve. The most important of those are : maximum production, full employment, equitable distribution of national wealth, better standard of living and social justice.

The idea of State controlling the economic organisation of the country has developed over a long period of time. Before the great Industrial Revolution, *laissez-faire* was an act of faith with the people. So deep was this faith, that Salignac, the 17th century thinker, wrote in his book *Telemachus* that "commerce is a kind of spring, which diverted from its natural channel, ceases to flow." The political philosophy of that time was symbolised in the dictum : "Good Government is that which governs the least." Marquis D'Argenson, the well-known French economist of the eighteenth century, did a lot in popularising this political concept. His continuous propaganda in favour of "less government, non-interference with industry and free international trade" imparted a good deal of respectability to the doctrine of *laissez-faire*. The belief in *laissez-faire*, as a specific cure for the country's economic ills, was not just a single unattached dogma. It was, indeed, an integral part of the social outlook of those times, whose other aspects were : a liberal attitude in political matters, independence of thought in the field of literature, high place for Protestantism in the domain of religion, and faith in the natural development of life because of the irresistible biological forces. In a pithy manner, Adam Smith in *The Wealth of Nations*, defined *laissez-faire* as "let nature have its course." The doctrine, in a detailed manner, was thus explained by Alfred Marshal in *Principles of Economics*. It means, he wrote, that "anyone should be allowed to make what things he likes and as he likes ; that all trades should be open to everybody and that goods and persons should be allowed to travel from one place to another without being subject to tolls and taxes, and vexatious regulations."

EQUILIBRIUM IN ECONOMICS

Although *laissez-faire* occupied a dominant place in the social philosophy of the 17th century, yet its best advocates like Smith and Ricardo felt that the State should, in the larger interests of the people, intervene in the economic life of the country, when considered essential. Of course, the control was to be as minimum as possible, and just enough to check palpable wrong tendencies. But when the Industrial Revolution gathered momentum and factories started springing up, new social and economic problems were created. The State at first took the benevolent attitude of a silent spectator, and allowed things to take their natural course, so that they might adjust themselves, as ordained by the founders of classical economics. Nevertheless, as the magnitude of social distress increased, the State was forced to revise its attitude of non-interference because of the inherent conflict between private interests and public good. Literary writers like Charles Dickens and Mrs. Gaskell contributed much in arousing the conscience of politicians against the inhuman sufferings brought about by the new pattern of large-scale mechanised production. Consequently, the State started actively intervening in the economic organisation with a view to setting right glaring social maladjustments. In this manner, the concept of State control gradually developed and the roots for the future growth of mixed economy were firmly laid. All this struck a death blow to the theory of *laissez-faire*. It is of interest to note that Mill had clearly foreseen the impending doom of *laissez-faire*. In 1833, in a letter to Carlyle, he wrote: "This principle, like many other negative ones, has work to do yet, work namely of a destroying kind, and I am glad to think that it has strength left to finish that, after which it must soon expire, for I doubt much if it will reach the resurrection."

III

FOR practical purposes State controls can be classified into three categories: emergent, operative and fundamental. Emergent controls are exercised in an emergency, usually created by war. Since the biggest stake before the country in such times is to preserve its political freedom, and to save the people from the perils of foreign domination, the necessity of such controls has never been challenged. Of course, big business, which wants to maximise profits even when the nation's future hangs in the balance, does not relish these all-important controls. But knowing that any resistance on its part would invite the wrath of the people and the enforcement of retaliatory measures by the State, the captains of industry submit to the dictates of authority.

Operative controls are employed by the Government to

remedy glaring defects that an unbridled capitalistic economy brings about. The purpose of these controls is not to reconstruct the economic system with the object of advancing the cause of social justice but merely to maintain some kind of an order in the economic life of the country, and check the growth of unsocial forces let loose by economic anarchism. Such controls are exercised even in countries where free enterprise is the mainstay of the economic structure. Needless to say, if an economy with high productive capacity were not subjected to some kind of controls, confusion in production would prevail. It is for this reason that a country like America, which is the home of capitalism, has been forced to intervene in "the merry but ruinous goings on of free enterprise." Yet, in view of the fact, that there is no social purpose behind operative controls, they are not all-pervasive in their application. An economy, which functions under the direction of such controls, has been likened by Lerner in his treatise *Economics of Control* to "an automobile without a driver but in which many passengers keep reaching over to the steering wheel to give it a twist, while complicated regulations prescribe the order and degree to which they may turn the wheel, so as to prevent them from fighting each other about it."

Controls of this nature have been employed in India since the formation of the National Government in 1947. The extent and scope of these controls can be easily judged from the words of Mr. T.T. Krishnamachari. The Union Minister for Commerce and Industry, says: "To-day, there is hardly any industry, hardly any business which is not controlled, which I cannot control if I want to. I mean, the reins are provided, the machinery at my disposal is efficient and adequate. I fully know that no man can produce a thing which I do not want him to produce. Nor can anyone sell a thing at a price at which I do not want him to sell. Even the contour movement of trade can be controlled. The controls to-day, so far as we are concerned, are perfect." In fact, he holds that even in a highly developed country like the United Kingdom, "the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or the President of the Board of Trade, has not the measure of control that we have in our country." It is because of the extensive use of the various Control Acts that our Government has succeeded in removing quite a lot of abuses, both in trade and industry, and in more or less, equalising the import-export trade and getting it under control and regularising it.

Although strategic controls serve as a barricade against periodic economic convulsions which business cycles generate, they lack the potential to ensure quick economic progress. Since operative controls have a limited corrective function to perform, they are unable to bring about far-reaching structural changes in the economic life of the country. Their achievements, however useful,

EQUILIBRIUM IN ECONOMICS

are of a negative character, in the sense, that gross anti-social tendencies, which are associated with capitalism, are not allowed to raise their ugly heads. But it is only through the instrumentality of fundamental controls that the entire economic system can be reorganised and the social wastes involved in free competition eliminated to accelerate the pace of human welfare. Operative controls at best serve the purpose of economic planning. But for a planned economy, fundamental controls are indispensable. The difference between economic planning and planned economy is deep. Planned economy is the basis of socialism, while economic planning keeps the capitalist society in a proper trim by avoiding lop-sided economic development. As such, for the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society, whose basic aim is to ensure freedom from exploitation, which is innate in a capitalist system, extensive use of fundamental controls becomes a social requisite. It is for this reason that the Avadi Resolution defining the economic policy to be pursued in bringing about the new social order, lays down that the State should "play a vital part in planning and development, and also have an over-all control of resources, social purposes and trends and essential balances in economy." The resolution further emphasises that the public sector is to play a "progressively greater part," but the private sector is also to have "a definite place in our economy."

It is true that the public sector has been assigned a significant role in refashioning the economic system on socialistic lines. Nevertheless, the private sector is not regarded as a no man's land to be encroached upon at the will and pleasure of the Government. To be precise, in a democratic Welfare State there is no anti-thesis between the State and the non-State sector. In an atmosphere of goodwill and mutual understanding, they have to co-operate with each other in realising the social aims of a planned economy. The importance given to both the sectors means that the economic structure of the country is to be of a mixed type and that only principal means of production are to be under social ownership or control. In such an economic system, socialism of the doctrinaire variety, which requires State ownership of all the means of production, is ruled out. Still the fundamental precept of socialism, *viz.* to provide economic emancipation of the masses, by rescuing them from the iron heel of exploitation, is accepted without any mental reservation. Even if there is to be no State ownership of all the means of production, the strategic positions in the economy have to be under the State authority. How is that to be done is best explained by Nehru in military terminology. The Prime Minister says: "An army does not occupy a country or place by planting a soldier in every nook and corner of it. It occupies it by taking command of all the strategic areas in it. The army

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

controls the entire area from these strategic places. A gun mounted on a hill enables the army to control effectively the surrounding areas. In the same way, we have to take charge of all the strategic positions in our economy, so that the work in the private and the public sector, may go on unhampered under an over-all plan, the national plan."

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

FEARS WITHOUT FACTS

Economic distress will teach men, if anything can, that realities are less dangerous than fancies, that fact-finding is more effective than fault-finding.

—CARL LOTUS BACKER: PROGRESS AND POWER

PPRIVATE enterprise has been given a worthy place in the proposed socialistic economy, because its elimination would be tantamount to the totalitarianism of the Russian type, which would militate against the democratic spirit of our Constitution, and annihilate the humane-social objectives enunciated in the Directive Principles on State Policy. Moreover, individual enterprise still possesses enough potentialities to increase the productive capacity of the country. As such, it forms an essential part of the new social organism. Yet, it is required to function under the socialist directional policies of the National Plan and its activities are to be regulated in the larger interests of the community. This necessarily means that the wings of excessive profit motive are to be clipped, and its immoral effects mitigated. It has further to be ensured that wealth does not concentrate in a few hands, or in a particular class, but is distributed among the people in an equitable manner. A peaceful solution of this type, for the country's economic problems, through social control, was commended even by Keynes in his book, *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*.

In a society inspired by egalitarian doctrines, the prime right of industrialists to profiteer, is no more sacrosanct than the divine right of kings to rule, according to their whims and fancies. Therefore, the private sector must attune itself to the new social climate. And if it creates any obstacles in the nation's march towards the new socialist goal, those obstacles are to be removed by the State. What does not hinder in building up the socialistic structure is permitted to flourish as before. The voluntary sector should realise that the pattern of political ideas and social values has changed, and it must adapt itself to the new social environment. Again, it must bear in mind that ours is a Welfare State, and to promote the economic welfare of the millions, who have been living under sub-human conditions, is its avowed fundamental object. The assertion of the anarchist philosopher, Kropotkin, that the State only "works in favour of the propertied

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

minority and against the propertyless," has no validity in the present-day context.

It is socially desirable that private enterprise should shed its accumulative proclivities and as the AICC observed at Ajmer, "it should function as a part of the National Plan keeping before it the national good, and not merely the individual, or group interest." In the projected socialistic pattern, big business has to give up its technique of planning production on the basis of 'organised scarcity' with a view to maximising profits. On the other hand, it should help the nation to produce more, so that the requirements of the people are satisfied plentifully and justly. In other words, it must produce for social use and not for profit. At present, the foremost object of private enterprise is to extract the largest amount of profit. Any service that is rendered to society is just incidental and not a part of production programme. It is not unusual to find that goods, which are most needed by the masses, are not manufactured, but only those are produced which the rich classes are willing to purchase. All this means that the country's resources are harnessed for the satisfaction of wants which are in the nature of luxuries, while basic needs go unsatisfied. The affirmation of Adam Smith that "the individual entrepreneur is led by an invisible Hand to promote an end which was no part of his intention, and that he serves the public best by following his own self-interest," does not hold true in the present-day economy. The celebrated classical economist, while laying down the maxim, had conceived of a free society of free men. That explains his moral reverence for private enterprise. But the society of his conception no longer exists where both industry and men would be free in the traditional sense of the term.

II

THE duties expected of the private sector in the nation's effort to establish the new equalitarian society have been defined in a straight forward manner. Yet, it stands to reason that by itself it will not be able to discharge them fully. That is why the Government has lost no opportunity in creating an appropriate climate of confidence for the proper functioning of free enterprise. The anxiety of the Government to help private industry can be judged from the fact that besides making technical assistance from foreign countries available to it, many of the recommendations of the Shroff Committee have been implemented, and financial help is being given both at the Centre and State level. Important credit institutions, like the Industrial Finance Corporation and Industrial Credit and Investment Corporation, have been

FEARS WITHOUT FACTS

set up to meet the fiscal requirements of private undertakings. In this respect, it may be mentioned that as early as 1947, the AICC at Delhi, had expressed the view that "the State should constitute Finance Corporations for financing industries." Moreover, the National Industrial Development Corporation, whose primary object is to cater to the needs of the public sector, has also been authorised to act "as the agency of the Government for the grant of special loans for the cotton textiles and jute industries." In addition to this technical aid and financial assistance, the Government has also extended to private enterprise concessions of high importance, so that it should work at top-speed and reach maximum targets of production. Firstly, the Government has allowed a Development Rebate of 25 per cent of the cost of the new plant and machinery installed for business purposes. The object of this concession is to help private enterprise to gear up the industrial capacity of the country. Secondly, the Government has permitted business concerns to carry forward their losses indefinitely instead of only for a period of six years.

All these measures unmistakably prove that the Government is not only alive to the vital role that private enterprise can play in establishing the projected socialistic society, but is also keen in creating conditions for its smooth and efficient functioning. The private sector, therefore, has to consider itself as an integral part of the controlled economic organisation of the country, and not as a class standing apart, only for bargaining with the Government for more and more. There is no such thing as rigid compartmentalism in our economy. Describing its character, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan says: "The mixed economy that we have adopted is like a park where we have a little natural growth and a little planned growth—both governed by an over-all purpose and design."

III

IT is argued that an economy, in which private enterprise is allowed to function as an important limb, is not likely to rest on firm foundations. In fact, certain quarters believe that instability is inherent in a mixed economy. This fear of instability is based on the assumption that since the motive force of private enterprise is to maximize profits, and the State through the mechanism of fundamental controls would like it to plan its production on the basis of social wants, and not with a view to extracting huge profits, it would not extend its co-operation to the State executive. It is held that this non-co-operation would become so intense that the Government would be obliged to relax its controls and enlarge the scope of concessions. This process, it is concluded, would go on

till the private sector regains its dominant position which would naturally mean the end of planning.

All these arguments sound plausible. But a little probe into the hard economic realities brings out the truth that they are merely based on theoretical suppositions. How? Firstly, the days of perfect competition are dead and gone; so the doctrine of profit maximization bears no validity. The industrialists to-day, because of the different economic conditions and radical changes in social thought, are guided more by the practical proposition of profit security than by the classical concept of full profit. It is an historical truth that a capitalist economy has the tendency to move three steps forward and then two steps backwards. These two peculiar traits of capitalism are popularly known as boom and depression. The main purpose of planning is to avoid these two extreme stages in the economic life of the country. This is done by creating semi-boom conditions by increasing State investment in public enterprises, which opens new vistas of employment, and thereby increases the purchasing power of the people. As a semi-boom climate will guarantee security in profit to private enterprise, it will not place hurdles in the Government's programme of economic development.

Secondly, it is just not possible for the private sector to offer systematized resistance because of its heterogeneous make-up. In a backward country, small and medium-sized industries are, not only large in number, but also possess a greater potential, both in terms of production and employment, than the big units. The capitalists should not remain under the illusion that the private sector is comprised of factories only. Apart from the popularly known two sectors—public and private—there is the huge third sector which represents the endless chain of small and cottage industries. Such industries being spread all over the country, and having no gross element of exploitation, will never combine with the organised sector to non-co-operate with the National Plan. Moreover, these small units of production are conscious of the fact, that it is on their ashes that the huge industries have grown up. Therefore, if big business chooses to create obstacles in the way of economic progress, the Government would give all-out help to small industries to produce consumer goods and expand the public sector to manufacture capital goods.

Thirdly, the private sector knows that it is not absolutely indispensable in a socialistic economy as has been proved by the Russian system of planning. It might bluff and bluster. Yet, it realises that continued obduracy would mean its complete extinction, because the Government being committed to free the masses from economic servitude, would carry on the task of social reconstruction, with or without, the private sector. And if the private

FEARS WITHOUT FACTS

sector makes planning within a democratic framework as something impossible, India, which is determined to establish a socialistic pattern, would be forced to think all over again about the democratic features of her political structure. Admittedly, our Constitution enjoys the highest sanctity. Still, as Mr. J.R. Lowell, the American poet, once wrote : "Man is more than constitutions." Hence, the democratic framework is not to be regarded as something absolutely rigid and incapable of any change for facing the challenge of difficulties created by private interests. Indeed, our Constitution is elastic enough to cope with changing needs. Burke was certainly right when he likened democratic constitution to "a vestment which accommodates itself to the body."

IV

THE Government is most anxious that the public, as well as the private sector, should play their respective roles in building up an egalitarian social order. This attitude of trust is understandable, for there is no basic incompatibility between the two sectors. Both are inter-related in the National Plan and must work in cohesion under the over-all direction of the State. None should digress from the path to be pursued towards achieving the socialist ideal. Any talk about belligerency between the State and the non-State enterprises is, to say the least, both futile and misleading. The dynamism of the present-day-situation demands that the artificial distinction between the public and the private sectors should be done away with. And, as Mr. U.N. Dhebar has put it, "the whole of India should become a national sector embodying both the private and the public sectors of our economy." It will not be wrong to say that the differentiation between the two sectors, in respect of their capacity to augment national wealth is just illusory. There is no rivalry between the two sectors, and if there is to be any, it should be in producing more for the good of the country. They are to be considered as the two strong arms in the national sector. The two arms should whole-heartedly co-operate with each other and gear up the industrial machinery, as the real problem before India is to increase wealth.

The private sector, however, should not get nervous if the scope of social control over it is extended. Nor should it get panicky at the expansion of the public sector, because its area of operation is bound to be enlarged as the economy is more and more socialised. In fact, its rapid extension in the field of basic industries is essential to ensure a proper advance in the direction of national economic self-sufficiency. Furthermore, if the private sector organises itself on a monopolistic or quasi-monopolistic basis

for increasing profits, by eliminating the element of free competition, the State shall have to enlarge the scope of the public sector to rescue the people from this new type of exploitation. The expansion of the public sector will also be necessitated by the fact that in an under-developed country like India, massive sums for large-scale industries are not likely to be raised by the private sector rapidly enough, or in a manner not involving undesirable social consequences.

The domain of the private sector has been defined, in as precise terms, as it is possible. If an encroachment is made on its sphere of influence, it will be explicitly for urgent economic reasons and essential social purposes. The private sector is not regarded as the fatted calf, to be feasted upon, just to satisfy the hunger of doctrinaire socialism. The democratic and humane concept of our socialist society requires, that there should be a harmonious blend of the two sections of the economic organisation, so that the declared goal of social justice is reached, without any conflict and strife, which by their very nature create new social problems.

In a mixed economy, whose character is bound to change, in accordance with the requirements of the country, the two sectors should not be extra sensitive, or over conscious, about their size and sphere of influence. Furthermore, democratic socialism is a gradual institution-building process, and no cast-iron pattern for economic development can be designed. If the private sector comes forward to set up a producer goods industry which normally falls within the purview of the public sector, and the State after satisfying itself that it fits into the framework of the National Plan, extends its co-operation in putting up that factory, the public sector should not regard it as an act of sacrilege against its special privileges. Similarly, if the Government decides to manufacture some consumer goods, which are of strategic importance and indispensable for the proper growth of the economy, but whose production is reserved for the voluntary sector, that should not be interpreted as ringing the death-knell of free enterprise. Let us see what Mr. C.D. Deshmukh has to say on this subject. The Finance Minister holds : "A mixed economy is not one in which the relative proportions in the mixture remain unchanged. In fact, they must change. Therefore, it is not correct to assume that any extension of one sector, is necessarily an invasion of the other, or a contraction of its opportunities." Again, discussing the dynamic role that both sectors must play in activating the industrial organisation, the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan says : "In a growing economy which gets increasingly diversified there is scope for both the public and the private sectors to expand simultaneously."

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

SETTING NEW STANDARDS

Socialism can succeed only on the basis of a high productivity of labour, higher than under capitalism, on the basis of an abundance of products and of articles of consumption of all kinds, on the basis of a prosperous and cultured life for all members of society.

—JOSEPH STALIN

PUBLIC sector, in one form or the other, exists in every country. Its pattern is, by and large, determined by the political ideology and social philosophy of the Government. The stage of economic development also constitutes a vital factor in moulding its structure. Broadly speaking, three different categories of public sector are to be found in modern world economy. In Russia, the State sector is all-pervasive and covers the entire field of agriculture, industry, commerce and services. This is the logical sequence of Article 4 of the Russian Constitution, which says that "the economic foundation is the socialist system of economy, and the socialist ownership of the instruments and means of production, firmly established, as a result of the liquidation of the capitalist system of economy, the abolition of private ownership of the instruments and means of production, and the elimination of the exploitation of man by man." In China too, the public sector has taken a similar shape. But, as yet, it has not embraced within its fold, the entire economy. Under the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, the State is required to utilise the beneficial qualities of private enterprise for the general welfare of the nation. At the same time, a strict control has to be exercised over it, to eliminate its anti-social tendencies.

The other extreme of a very limited public sector is to be found in America. Its scope is confined to those few enterprises which are considered of absolute importance in national interests. This is understandable, as the Constitution of the United States recognises the right of every citizen to own property and start any economic enterprise that he might desire. These constitutional guarantees have been inspired by an invincible faith in the philosophy of individualism. Private property is looked at with some kind of moral reverence, and the laws protecting it are regarded, as ethical precepts in the imperative. For that reason, Abraham Lincoln had said: "Property is desirable, is a positive good in the

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

world."

In between these two extreme varieties of public sectors, the middle category exists in England, France and Italy. Although, these countries are not ideologically committed to the deliberate and conscious enlargement of the State sector, yet it has been making progress, because of certain essential social and economic reasons. Since these nations were not tied down to the doctrine of economic determinism, the expansion of the public sector has been gradual, as the course of socialisation followed progression in social philosophy.

In India, the evolution of the public sector has been more or less unique, and its pattern bears little resemblance to that of other countries. The logic of this difference in the socialistic sector is understandable, for just as a liquid acquires the shape of its container, similarly the process of socialisation adapts itself to the peculiar character of a particular economy.

II

NOW let us examine in detail the development of the public sector in our own country. Before Independence, the State controlled sector existed only in name. The few undertakings that the British Government managed were of such a nature which private capital just could not afford to run. There was no social purpose behind these State enterprises. But the National Government in its 1948 Resolution on Industrial Policy defined the social objectives of its economic programme, and declared: "A dynamic national policy must be directed to a continuous increase in production by all possible means, side by side with measures to secure its equitable distribution. The problem of State participation in industry, and the condition in which private enterprise should be allowed to operate, must be judged in this context." This announcement clearly meant that the State was to intervene in the economic life of the country and thereby restrict the excessive unsocial effects of free capitalism. But all the same, this Policy Statement represented a "general theoretical approach" and was meant to meet the needs of the transition period. Of course, the approach was for practical purposes. However, the broad objectives of the Industrial Policy were defined in a precise manner in the Constitution, and a lucid social policy was thus enunciated. The Directive Principles on State Policy, among other things, laid down that "the State shall direct its policy towards securing that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are distributed as best to subserve the common good," and "that the operation of the economic system does not result in the con-

SETTING NEW STANDARDS

centration of wealth, and means of production to the common detriment." Thus, the necessity to control the economic organisation with a view to advancing the cause of social and economic justice, received the high sanction of the Constitution. Later on, the First Five-Year Plan launched on December 7, 1952, re-emphasised the respective roles of the two sectors in achieving the social aims, as adumbrated in the Constitution. Again, in December 1954, Parliament amended the 1948 Industrial Policy by giving it a new interpretation.

As the political views of the people were fast changing, and the nation was in no mood to tolerate income and wealth disparities which persisted, in spite of the extensive controls that the Government exercised over the economic structure, it was decided at the Avadi Session of the Congress, that the entire social system should be reshaped on socialistic lines. This naturally meant, as the Economic Policy Resolution stated that "the public sector must play a progressively greater part, more particularly, in the establishment of basic industries." From all these four stages in the growth of the public sector, we find that its progress has neither been influenced by any doctrinaire approach nor has its expansion been governed by any rigid social theory. Its advancement has been based on the peculiar social conditions and economic requirements of the country. This evolutionary march is in keeping with the best democratic traditions, because in democracy, as pointed out by the English philosopher, Anthony Cooper, principles become modified in practice by facts.

III

THE rapid extension of the public sector raises the all important question about the type of management which is best suited for State undertakings. The issue is vital inasmuch as on the proper running of the State sector depends the success of planned development. As a matter of fact, a socialised economy without social efficiency is a misnomer. If State enterprises are conducted in a clumsy manner, not only will a portion of public money be squandered, but the urgent needs of the common people will remain unsatisfied as well. This will naturally increase the volume of social frustration. Consequently, the nation's growing faith in socialism, as a cure for social ills, will suffer a serious set-back. Such a situation is likely to be exploited by the high priests of capitalism, and a revivalist campaign for the restoration of the "divine rights" of private enterprise might make serious headway. An advocacy of this sort, is likely to take the ugly shape of a counter revolutionary movement, which the capitalists attempt to organise,

when State planning becomes discredited. All these things may not happen, yet the potential danger cannot be ignored or belittled. The only way to ward it off is to run public undertakings as efficiently as their counterparts in the non-State sector. As yet, no specific pattern of organisation for the management of public enterprises has been evolved in India. The reasons are twofold. Firstly, there is not enough experience in the matter and, secondly, no particular type of organisation has shown any outstanding success. This problem of organisational backwardness has to be tackled with a sense of urgency, so that the conduct of economic activity in the State sector becomes above reproach. Indeed, our ideal in the proposed socialistic economy should be to make the management of public undertakings a worthy model to be copied by the private sector.

This vexed problem of evolving an appropriate institutional structure for the efficient running of State industries is not peculiar to India ; other countries which started socialising their economies, had to face it as well. For instance, in Russia after the October Revolution, private business was taken over by the Government, and placed under the direct charge of the various branches of the Supreme Council of National Economy. Centralisation being an article of faith with the Soviet leaders, the newly nationalised enterprises were not allowed any freedom whatsoever to manage their own affairs. However, experience indicated that too much centralisation hampered the proper development of production units. Therefore, in 1923, Lenin decided to set up State Trusts for their management. For a few years, these Trusts conducted the affairs of State industries with the object of making profits. In 1928, the First Five-Year Plan was launched, and their aim was defined as the realisation of the social objectives of the Plan.

In England, France and Italy, the pattern of organisation for public undertakings has been different from that in Russia. That is due to the variance in the political ideology. Moreover, the form of management is influenced by the general economic conditions, and in particular, by the prevalent state of industrial development. Even in these countries, no standardized form of organisation to conduct socialised enterprises has as yet been evolved. It can, however, be stated that the trend is towards the creation of corporations in which the power of the Government is vested, but which also possess the independence and flexibility of private companies. This internal autonomy is imperative to ensure speedy progress and permits the fullest use of local initiative. Although autonomous bodies are free from every outside control, Parliament has to exercise its over-all authority over them, because an expenditure of hundreds of crores of public money is involved in State undertakings. Of course, the control should not be

SETTING NEW STANDARDS

excessive, for that would tend to militate against the initiative and independence of the Board of Directors. As to what should be the degree of Parliamentary control is very difficult to determine. Even the Planning Commission has refrained from answering the vexed question. It merely expresses the view that "the extent of autonomy which can be insisted on, is a matter on which it is difficult to dogmatise without further experience."

Roughly speaking, the institution of a public corporation represents a compromise between the Fabian School which wanted direct State management of public enterprises, and the Syndicalist School which insisted that it was the right of workers to run them. This middle course is symbolic of the spirit of conciliation inherent in democracy. Discussing the social importance of avoiding extremes, Burke appropriately remarked that "all governments—indeed, every human benefit and enjoyment, every virtue and every prudent act, is founded on compromise." In India too, a similar pattern of organisation has been adopted. The Planning Commission has commended its wider acceptance. It says: "Several of undertakings directly under the Central Government have been organised with Boards of Directors vested with powers of management in the same manner as in the case of joint stock companies in the private sector. This form of organisation appears to be suitable at the present stage and should be extended."

IV

A PUBLIC corporation has an administrative structure almost like that of a limited company. Yet, the composition of the Board of Directors is different, and so are their duties and responsibilities. The Directors of an autonomous corporation are nominated by the Government, and have no personal interest in the business they manage. As such, unlike the Directors of a private concern, their aim is not to multiply profits but to look after the social needs of the community. It should not be forgotten that the object of investment in the non-State sector is to make profit, and as such, the yardstick is there to measure its success. On the contrary, the investment in the State sector is inspired by the ideal of social good and, consequently, it is immeasurable. This raises the complex question of fixing the prices of products. While the consumers would like to have goods of real quality with the lowest possible price, the employees would prefer maximum wages with the finest welfare facilities. If the demand of the consumers is conceded, the interests of the workers suffer. And, if the wish of the workers is fulfilled, the cost of production goes up which means that ordinary people would not be in a position to satisfy their wants. Therefore,

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

the supply prices should be fixed after striking a balance between the competing claims of different social classes. On the one hand, the State should be a "model employer" and, on the other, it should safeguard the interests of the consumers by providing them with goods and services at a reasonable price. Needless to say, unless that is done, the social objectives of the public sector would not be wholly realised.

It is said that a public corporation should make profits to enable the Government to invest this income in other socially essential industries. Apparently, this argument sounds plausible. Yet, sometimes it is necessary to provide services and goods at prices lower than the actual cost to promote general welfare of the community. For instance, if electricity is supplied at a rate much cheaper than its production cost, it would certainly mean loss to the Government, but the social good would be far in excess of the deficit, as the poorest classes would be in a position to make use of electricity. Hence, if certain Government enterprises show an adverse balance, that should not be solely attributed to the inefficiency of the Board of Directors. The price policy of a public corporation, and its efficiency are not necessarily co-related. Moreover, if the cost of production in State-owned undertakings, in terms of money becomes high, it is amply compensated by the low social cost. Of course, the guiding principle in fixing the supply prices should be "no profit, no loss." And once the actual expenses are covered, other social considerations should come into the picture.

The observance of this principle is obligatory because the directors being members of the permanent civil service, and not having any pecuniary interest in the socialised enterprises, are prone to become bureaucrats. This fear of inefficiency creeping into the public sector is not just illusory. Indeed, it is based on some experience. Public corporations work under monopolistic, or semi-monopolistic conditions. Since there is no competition to serve as an incentive, slackness is not unusual. Lethargy is also likely to develop into incompetence, as the Ministry in charge of State undertakings devotes little time to their working. It is hard pressed by other administrative and parliamentary duties. And Parliament itself exercises its control over them hardly once in a year, at the time of Budget discussions, or on some other special occasion. It can also not be denied that the social conscience of our public servants, which should act as an inspiration for hard work, is not as yet fully developed. It is high time that the civil service fully appreciated the significance of Jefferson's dictum that "when a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property." All these factors make it imperative that the basic principles of economics should mould the policies of the top

SETTING NEW STANDARDS

executives in the public sector. And, if any departure has to be made from the classical tenents, it must be to promote the social welfare of the country, and not to shield the incompetency of the management.

V

A LARGE number of public corporations have already been set up in our country. Being separate legal entities, they are naturally working independently of each other and under insulated conditions. Nor are they under one Ministry. It will be worthwhile if a central body to co-ordinate the broad policies of these different autonomous bodies is created. This strategy will also be of help in pooling experience and knowledge of all State undertakings for the benefit of new enterprises in the public sector. In fact, such valuable information can be passed on to the private sector as well. Moreover, this central agency can, from time to time, place before Parliament a broad picture of the general working of public corporations.

The private sector, even though it is addicted to certain social defects, possesses a great deal of accumulated knowledge of running industries. To benefit from this knowledge, the administrative personnel in charge of State enterprises should spend some time in private undertakings.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

DEMOLITION OF DOGMA

To question all things ;—never to turn away from any difficulty ; to accept no doctrine either from ourselves or from other people without a rigid scrutiny by negative criticism ; letting no fallacy, or incoherence, or confusion of thought, slip by unperceived ; above all, to insist upon having the meaning of a word clearly understood before using it, and the meaning of a proposition before assenting to it :—these are the lessons we learn from ancient dialecticians.

—JOHN STUART MILL

IT is, indeed, a matter of satisfaction that in spite of the many factors, which tend to bring down the standards of efficiency in the public sector, State enterprises in India, during the short period of their existence, have shown good results. For instance, the fertilizer factory at Sindri and the railway collieries as a whole, have yielded handsome profits. The only industry which has been working under deficit is the Hindustan Shipyard. But it has to be borne in mind that every shipyard industry all the world over, in one form or the other, receives subsidy from the Government. The Hindustan Shipyard, even when it was in private hands, was running at a big loss, and the promoters made it clear that they could not afford to bear the losses any further. As the shipping industry is of paramount importance to the economic progress of the country, the Government knowing that it was a losing proposition, took over the Hindustan Shipyard. The losses in terms of money, even if they continue for some time, will be amply compensated by other national gains, which increased shipping tonnage bring by extending transport facilities. So great is the importance of shipping that in *Society and Solitude*, Emerson maintains that "the most advanced nations are always those who navigate the most."

The success of public enterprises, coupled with the social objectives of the State sector, and the nation's declaration to establish a socialistic pattern of society, have raised the pertinent question of nationalising the existing voluntary industries. Of course, some look at nationalisation as the magic remedy for our economic maladies. Consequently, it has become a national slogan with them. This is not surprising because, as Goethe once said : "The

DEMOLITION OF DOGMA

phrases men are accustomed to repeat incessantly end by becoming convictions, and ossify the organs of intelligence." They do not seem to realise, that nationalisation as a dogma, tends to disturb the economic equilibrium, and thereby, does more harm than any good to the country. Being blind worshippers of socialism as an idol, they do not care to weigh the pros and cons of nationalisation in the scale of hard realities. Needless to say, unless social and economic problems are faced squarely, their solution can never be found. Nations are not judged by the theories to which they subscribe, but by their capacity to undertake great tasks of social reconstruction. That is why Nehru asserts that "the test must always be the results to be achieved, and not some theoretical formula." The supreme problem before the nation is to increase wealth so that the gap between perceptible inequalities is narrowed down in the absence of which all talk about egalitarianism is futile. The problem is gigantic, and obviously, it cannot be tackled by brandishing catch phrases in the air without realising their practical implications. Raising of slogans, in season and out of season, only betrays a surrender to dogmatism, and the lack of propriety in judgment. "Slogans," Mr. James Bryant Conant says, "are both exciting and comforting, but they are also powerful opiates for the conscience."

II

CONSIDERED from the standpoint of Indian conditions, nationalisation does not take us far. The reasons for such a viewpoint are detailed below. First, India has not the financial resources to pay for the acquisition of private industries. Compensation has to be given, as the Constitution makes it obligatory. And this compensation is not to be merely nominal but "just and reasonable." The Government also, by its policy statements made at the highest level, has categorically stated that "there is no room for appropriation in India, and that it does not consider it honourable to just snatch away anybody's property." This stand is logical because democratic socialism does not believe in the infamous doctrine of the French anarchist, Proudhon, namely that all property is theft. Property in the hands of private individuals is not necessarily a social evil, unless its possession stands in the way of country's progress. Indeed, if the State, in order to promote social good, decides to acquire any private property, human justice demands that its owner should be adequately compensated.

Communists, who advocate forcible acquisition, forget that Russia long after the October Revolution, paid compensation for the foreign-owned undertakings that it had taken over. This was

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

considered necessary to raise its international prestige and gain confidence of foreign countries. And, so far as the confiscation of Russian property is concerned, it was resorted to because of the violent upheavals that rocked the country. The policy of expropriation was the natural corollary of the terrible war, and the murderous civil commotion, through which Russia was forced to pass. Since India has been saved from these horrible and frightening conditions, forcible expropriation of private property cannot be its public policy.

Secondly, if the resources of the country were utilised in shifting certain undertakings from the private to the public sector, that would neither make any difference to the productive capacity of the nation, nor would new opportunities for employment be created. This status quo will obviously prevent the full swing of dynamism in the economic progress of the nation. For that reason, India's Home Minister, Mr. G. B. Pant, says: "While the State must have over-all control of all activities, anyone who sought to add to the wealth of the country should not be prevented from doing it, provided he accepts his position as a citizen, carrying out his own schemes within the purview of the country's plan. Similarly, it should be remembered that employment is the primary need of the nation. Avenues for increasing employment should be welcomed, whichever be the quarters they emanate from, provided they are consistent with the National Plan." Therefore, to consider nationalisation as an emblem of progress is both meaningless and absurd. In fact, nationalisation of industries in private hands, at this stage of India's economic development, would weaken the country's economy, instead of bringing any benefit. Nationalisation in highly industrialised countries does not produce the same deleterious effects, for there it bears a different meaning and purpose. Of course, the socialists, who have set their score by nationalisation, would have the satisfaction that the public sector had gained, what Lenin called, "the commanding heights of the economy." Further, the socialists might feel that acquisition of private industry would be tantamount to some kind of economic equalisation. But, it would be an equalisation at the lowest level and, consequently, the very negation of purposeful egalitarianism. The fundamental objective of the socialistic pattern is to improve the living conditions of the masses. This is done by increasing production, and giving them full employment, and thereby enabling them to purchase goods for their day-to-day needs. The real social purpose of socialism is best explained by Henry George in his book *Social Problems*, when he says: "The ideal social State is not that in which each gets an equal amount of wealth, but in which each gets in proportion to his contribution to the general stock."

DEMOLITION OF DOGMA

Thirdly, the investment of money in new basic industries, for which the country is hungry, would not only create new avenues of employment, but the capital goods produced by the mother industries would help in starting thousands of small and light industries in the private sector. These units of production, besides increasing national wealth, would also be absorbing the huge army of the unemployed, who constitute a social menace to our infant democracy. Needless to say, if the private sector were not there to help the public sector in the consumption of electric power and other products of heavy industries, the primary social functions of such State enterprises would be greatly restricted. Hence, it is socially essential that money should not be locked up in acquiring existing private industries, but utilised in starting new projects.

Fourthly, nationalisation would mean taking over old units, with obsolete industrial machinery. This would hardly be an act of wisdom when atomic energy in the near future is going to be used in factories. Just as steam and electric power revolutionised the techniques of production, in a similar way atomic energy would dynamise industrial technology, however advanced it might look from the present standards. Atomic energy when utilised for industrial purposes would turn an economics of scarcity into an economics of plenty.

Fifthly, if nationalisation is accepted as an indispensable instrument of social progress, no new industry in the private sector would be started. This is obvious because the sword of acquisition would always be hanging on the private sector. Such economic staleness would defeat the national aim of increasing wealth, without which all talk of socialism is but an empty prattle.

Sixthly, most of the big industries are limited liability concerns, with a large number of shareholders. Nationalisation would mean depriving these people of their shares, and the little extra income they get in the form of dividends.

Seventhly, nationalisation would antagonise a section of society, and the seeds of conflict would naturally be sown. The social consequences of class struggle are too ugly to be experienced. In the new social order, every kind of conflict and strife is to be avoided because the whole programme of rebuilding India is based on the willing co-operation of the 360 million people. Indeed, every individual belonging to this mass of humanity is to be persuaded to join the high adventure of social reconstruction.

Eighthly, the very existence of private enterprise, side by side with public enterprise is essential, for that would create a healthy climate of competition between the two, and consequently, higher standards of efficiency would be reached in the national economy. In particular, the private sector would provide an inducement to

the public sector.

And lastly, we do not have a huge State personnel with acumen, experience and ability of those in whose hands private industries are to-day flourishing. It is likely that when they are taken over, their productive capacity might be adversely affected, due to the lack of administrative efficiency.

III

ALL these arguments leave no room for doubt, that nationalisation by itself, will not establish the socialistic society of our conception. In fact, its indiscriminate advance might impede the progressive social good that the new order envisages. Those who wish to measure the progress of India merely by the extent to which the non-State sector is suppressed in favour of the State sector, seem to have a mind rich in dogmas but closed to the actuality of Indian conditions. Admittedly, in the new socialistic economy, the public sector must advance. "But if it merely nibbles into the private sector, instead of advancing itself, there will be no real and total progress in the country," warns the Railway Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri. Therefore, nationalisation should not be regarded as an end in itself, but only as a means to promote the social and economic interests of the nation.

Nationalisation should not be confused with socialism. It is, undoubtedly, one of the roads to socialism. It is of paramount importance that socialism should be understood in terms of its objectives rather than the means only. The difference between nationalisation and socialisation of economy is not just academic but real. The reality of socialism can certainly be achieved, in a great measure, by the strategy of social control. It is wrong to presume that socialism can only be brought about by the rigid Marxian technique of social ownership. Indiscreet nationalisation might bring some quantitative socialism, without a qualitative change in the economy, and values and attitudes of the people. In fact, such nationalisation might lead to Fascism, as the Government can, under the garb of nationalisation, start working in collaboration with big industrialists. This state of affairs, ultimately developed into National Socialism, in Hitler's Germany. The meaningful words of Mr. U. N. Dhebar that "it is possible without acquiring ownership to so plan production that the country can achieve its social goal," should be heeded by the trumpet-beaters of nationalisation.

In the new social philosophy, there is little room for belief in nationalisation for the sake of nationalisation, as India's approach to all problems is essentially pragmatic and not dogmatic. At the

DEMOLITION OF DOGMA

same time, it must be frankly stated that the Government would not hesitate to take over any industry, or business, if the country's economic progress demanded it, or it was considered to be in public good.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

DEMOCRACY BEATS DICTATORSHIP

Is not the best ordered State that which most nearly approaches to the condition of the individual; as in the body, when but a finger is hurt, the whole frame drawn towards the soul, and forming one realm under the ruling power therein, feels the hurt and sympathises altogether with the part affected, and we say that the man has a pain in his finger ?

—PLATO : REPUBLIC

WITH the broad objectives of the new social order all progressive thinking people are in agreement. Differences, if any, are but a question of emphasis on the targets and priorities to be fixed in matters of social reconstruction. But, so far as the means to achieve the socialistic aims are concerned some feel that democratic methods do not have the necessary dynamism to establish a society in which the laws of equality, social justice, and non-exploitation will prevail. They hold that it is only through a bloody revolution that the social system can be radically changed. The words of Engels that "force is the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with the new," and that "it is the instrument with whose aid social movement forces its way, and shatters the dead, fossilized political forms," seem to be an article of faith with them. Believers in the Russian line want us to use blood and iron to reshape our social structure. But the Indian Marxists conveniently forget, that the communist countries were forced to have recourse to violence, because of the extraordinary conditions that obtained. Moreover, they do not realise that these nations have had to pay a very heavy price for this strategy. In fact, confusion and chaos prevailed for some time, and internal discord stood in the way of real progress.

It does not stand to reason that India should copy methods of other countries for effecting the economic emancipation of the masses. Needless to say, if the methods of civil war are adopted to "expropriate the expropriators," the country is bound to become weak and other countries might jump in and dominate it politically. Emerson was not indulging in any exaggeration when he declared: "Imitation is suicide." Each country has to choose its own path of progress, consistent with its historical background and cultural traditions. Mr. James Bryce rightly points

DEMOCRACY BEATS DICTATORSHIP

out in *Essays in History and Jurisprudence* that "the past can never be effaced, since the recollection of it is an element in shaping the future." India regained her political freedom through non-violent methods and was spared the sufferings which follow a violent upheaval. In his unique ways, Gandhiji stood like a rock between imperialism and nationwide civil war. For that reason, he was cryptically called by Miss Ellen Wilkinson, "the best policeman of the Englishman." India's age-long tolerance and spirit of forbearance have always enabled her to forestall a bloody revolution. Therefore, it is but logical that she should adopt peaceful methods in transforming the social and economic life of the country. The new equalitarian order will be brought about, not through the iron rod of law, but through the gentle art of persuasion. Of course, if independence had come to us through a blood-bath, our methods for reconstruction might have been different, for in the words of Lincoln, "we cannot escape history."

II

WILLING and mutual co-operation is essential, because India wants to secure economic advance within a tolerant and humane society without sacrificing individual liberty. And personal liberty, as Lord Lytton, once said, "is the paramount essential to human dignity and human happiness." Other socialist countries have tried to raise economic standards through authoritarianism and regimentation of the masses. In such countries, personal freedom has no meaning and individual initiative has no purpose. But in the new society that we conceive of, both the self and the society have to march forward, in a balanced and harmonious manner. This is only possible if the dignity of human personality is recognised, and respect is shown to creative urges which determine, and also correct social behaviour. It is true that economics plays a dominant part in a man's life. Still, man does not live merely by eating and drinking. There are other spiritual and cultural values whose pursuit makes genuine progress possible. Indeed, the English historian, Dr J.A. Froude, in *Short Studies in Great Subjects*, maintains that "spiritual regeneration comes first, moral after it, political and social last." That is why Gandhiji had integrated the question of moral uplift with the over-all struggle for independence. Moral resurrection of the people can never be effected through force and coercion. Only in an atmosphere of freedom and democracy does the spirit of man find conditions for proper development. "Be assured," Ruskin emphasized in *The Eagle's Nest*, "that you can no more force or compress men into perfection than you can force or compress plants." India's social ideals being high, it

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

is imperative that high principles should be followed, and right means adopted, to establish a society in which both the "standard of living" and the "standard of life" will be raised in an integrated manner.

Of what avail will material prosperity be, if the nation loses its soul? This is bound to happen if the people are hustled into economic growth. Mere abundance of goods does not take a nation forward. The socialist pattern aims at developing the total personality of man, because the true greatness of a nation is in those qualities which constitute the greatness of the individual. "We want men of high calibre, with lofty thoughts and ideals, declares Nehru, "to work in a free atmosphere and conceive great things and execute them for the greatest good of the people and the country."

III

APART from the obvious fact that totalitarian methods strangle the creative urges of the individual and imprison his spirit, and thus, turn him into a mere cog in the giant machine of the State, they even lack long-term efficiency in improving the living conditions of the people. Surely, in the beginning compulsive ways appear to be fast, as the parliamentary procedure of exhaustive discussions and long debates is avoided, and spectacular results are promised. But, force breeds hatred, and people turn indignant. Consequently, their co-operation becomes half-hearted and halting. In fact, because of the bitterness that coercion creates, they do offer resistance, however suppressed and unorganised, it might be. All this retards the progress of national development. Forced labour can never yield results which voluntary co-operation can do. No wonder Napoleon, during his last days of self-introspection at St. Helena declared: "The more I study the world, the more am I convinced of the inability of brute force to create anything durable."

Democratic methods appear slow at the start, because the process of educating the masses has to be followed to enlist their voluntary co-operation. Yet, once the social consciousness of the people is awakened and their enthusiasm aroused, the whole nation moves forward in a disciplined and determined manner. More increase in the national wealth, without a feeling of self-fulfilment among the people, which comes only through willing participation in the work of reconstruction, does not make the country strong. Strength of the people springs from social cohesion, and for that the psychological integration of the people with the nation-building activities of the State is essential. Consent of the common folk, secured through moral persuasion, creates new

DEMOCRACY BEATS DICTATORSHIP

faith in their capabilities. And faith, according to Tolstoy, "is the force of life." It, therefore, introduces dynamism into social effort and the silent revolution of reconstruction proceeds in a steady but sure manner. In a democratic society, the jerks and jolts of authoritarian methods are eliminated, and abiding results achieved. "A republican Government," says Jefferson, "is slow to move, yet once in motion, its momentum becomes irresistible."

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

INDIA AFTER INDEPENDENCE

New and stirring things are belittled, because if they are not belittled, the humiliating question arises: "Why then are you not taking part in them?"

—H. G. WELLS: THE WORLD OF WILLIAM CLISSOLD

THE unexpected progress that India has made in all spheres of economic activity, during the short span of nine years, unmistakably proves the efficacy of co-operative methods. The remarkable success of welfare schemes, like the Community Projects and the National Extension Service, illustrates the great vitality that willing co-operation possesses. India's achievements have been recognised time and again by foreigners. Sir Alexander Clutterbuck thinks that "India has made tremendous progress—a progress greater than anybody has the right to expect." Mr. Paul Hoffman says: "Those of us who have been privileged to see modern India are astonished by the progress made in less than a decade." The Rt. Hon. Mr. A.R.W. Low observes that "India has proved her ability to take a distinctive place among the leading countries of the world." Nowhere else in the world has the work of social transformation been undertaken, on such a large scale, with a view to raising the living standards of so many people, on so genuine a co-operative basis. Nine years is a short period, especially when India regained her freedom after a long period of subjugation and cruel exploitation by alien rulers. Social attitudes of the people, because of continuous suppression, tended to be less progressive. Moreover, when freedom came, India had to face unprecedented problems created by the Second World War and partition of the country. Here we make a passing reference to some of the major problems.

A static economy, petrified by under-development, had been passed on to the new Government. The agricultural sector bore the burdens of rank feudalism. Except in the case of big industries, lakhs of small units of production were run on primitive lines. The food situation was precarious. Even the declaration of the Government to attain self-sufficiency in food was considered to be a big bluff. Within a period of few months more than a million refugees, penniless, broken-hearted and shattered in spirit, arrived in India. Due to communal madness that engulfed the country, we even lost the Master who had secured us freedom. More than

INDIA AFTER INDEPENDENCE

six hundred States, which had been granted freedom by Whitehall, threatened to throw the country into the whirlpool of constitutional anarchy. Other disruptive forces were also working insidiously, creating deep creeks in the political structure. People even lacked sense of security, and a dismal atmosphere of unrest prevailed. The country, it seemed, was heading towards a crisis. The gravity of the situation is appropriately explained by Mr. U. N. Dhebar. He says: "A little miscalculation on the Ruler's front and India would to-day have become a jig-saw puzzle, a land of many 'stans' with no central authority. A little complacency on the food front and India would have been a land of sorrows—another Bengal multiplied fifty times, or even hundred. A little slackness on the Refugees' front would have also meant a similar disaster." Yet, the willing co-operation that the people extended to the new Government enabled it to overcome all the obstacles, and lay strong foundations for the orderly progress of the nation. The verse of Sophocles, the noted Greek dramatist, provides an apt picture of India after a few years of independence:

*The ship of State—the gods once more,
After much rocking on a stormy surge,
Set her on even keel.*

II

TO-DAY, there is a general sense of satisfaction in having achieved solid results. This feeling of self-fulfilment is a great national asset, even greater than the putting up of big factories. But, all the same, there is a growing awareness that much more still remains to be done. This consciousness is essential, as nations decay, when the pride of progress makes them over confident. Success has to be treated as a call for further action. Of course, there are critics who applaud achievements of other countries and see little in what India has done. Such critics have been correctly described by Mr. H.W. Beecher as "the human owl, vigilant in darkness and blind to light, mousing for vermin, and never seeing noble game." Instead of creating depressing social environment, these neurotic persons should ask themselves as to what they are doing for the good of the people. In case they really wish well to India, it is high time that they stopped their malicious talk and did some socially useful work in a responsible manner. The present generation, Dr. B.C. Roy, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, tells us, "has a rendezvous with destiny." If we all take part in the mighty enterprise to build the new order, our efforts will be remembered with gratitude by posterity.

The attitude of despair and despondency is anti-national if

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

not subversive, especially when there is no justification for it. And national honour, as Monroe, in his First Inaugural Address said, "is national property of the highest value." Talking ill of India, in the present context, is to insult the simple and sincere masses who have been participating in the great work of reconstruction which is making India's destiny. Their capacity for self-sacrifice and the stamina for hard work, are the pride of Free India, and the surest guarantee for the peaceful transformation of the economic system. While the attitude of cynics is to be deplored, cool complacency should not be allowed to prevail. Even Hegel, the philosopher of reason, could not help writing in *Philosophy of History*, that "nothing great in the world has ever been accomplished without passion." The task of reshaping the social pattern on egalitarian lines has just begun. The path to reach the cherished goal of a classless society is long and also beset with all manner of difficulties. Nothing in other countries has been achieved by magic. We have to achieve in a few decades what was accomplished by countries like England and America in a couple of centuries. When India, owing to her loss of freedom, fell into the slough of inertia, other nations stole a march over her. This period of degeneration was nothing unusual. In the life of every country comes a phase of decline after an epoch of prosperity. In fact, this cycle of rise and fall has determined the destinies of many civilizations. Impelled by facts of history, H.G. Wells, aptly advised: "If you fell down yesterday, stand up to-day." Therefore, undeterred, we have to speed up our pace to remove poverty, disease, illiteracy and unemployment, if we wish to catch up with other advanced countries. In this social crusade, time alone is the enemy. But, under the dynamic leadership of Nehru, backed by the sound commonsense and new faith of the masses, the great battle against social and economic injustice will be won earlier than expected.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

COMPARISON WITHOUT CRITICISM

False democracy shouts: every man down to the level of the average. True democracy cries: all men up to the height of their fullest capacity for service and achievement.

—N. M. BUTLER: TRUE AND FALSE DEMOCRACY

THERE is a strong feeling among the admirers of communism, that the progress that India has made, does not stand any comparison to the great achievements of Russia and China. Comparisons are odious, said Christopher Marlowe, as far back as four centuries. Nevertheless, sometimes they are necessary to clear misconceptions and remove false beliefs. Let us have a broad appraisalment of Russia's achievements.

After the October Revolution in 1917, Russia took eleven years to produce the draft of its First Five-Year Plan. During this intervening period, "Russia had to pass through famine, bloodshed, economic and social conflict and almost chaotic conditions." Of course, the world did not know much of these trials and tribulations. But, as pointed out by the French radical, Mr. H.L. Earnst, "in a free country there is much clamour, with little suffering; in a despotic State there is little complaint, with much grievance."

On the other hand, India after four years of its independence came out with a plan which was the first of its kind, because of its humanitarian-democratic approach. Most of the targets set by the Planning Commission have already been fulfilled, and this has engendered an undying faith in our capacity to plan in a still bigger way. But many targets fixed by the Russian planners were not realised even at the end of the Plan period. In fact, in items like grain, sugar, cotton and woollen textiles, the production after the final phase of the Plan, was less than the pre-Plan level. The common man had to undergo further hardships as a result of the shortage of basic necessities of life. These hardships had to be borne by the people "not only during the First Five-Year Plan, but also under successive plans due to the lack of consumer goods, resulting in a lower standard of living, and to other conditions of life prevalent there." From this the extent of human suffering, which results from totalitarian methods, can be judged. This was nothing unusual because, as Carlyle says in *Past and Present*, "violence does even justice unjustly." Although, Russia has been planning in a vigorous way for more than 26 years to increase its

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

agricultural production, and had the advantage of having huge areas, almost virgin and unexploited, yet last year Mr. Malenkov, the former Russian Prime Minister, confessed that the agricultural policy had not fully succeeded. But so far as heavy industry is concerned, production has certainly been most noteworthy. The magnitude of progress made in the industrial sector is highlighted by Prof. A. Notkin. The leading Soviet economist, says: "Before the Second World War, the volume of the industrial output of the USSR was only slightly larger than that of Germany, or of Great Britain. It is now larger than the combined output of both Great Britain and Western Germany; and it approximates to the pre-war output of the U.S.A."

Summing up the achievements of communist countries, Mr. Colin Clark, the British economist, recently stated: "They might boast of heavy increase in industrial output but they have not been able to boost up agricultural production." In India, the emphasis in the First Plan has been on the expansion of agricultural production and increase in the output of consumer goods for making the life of the masses easier than before. The stress on commodities needed for day-to-day life was essential, because India being a democratic country, had to fulfil its responsibilities towards Demos. Some capital goods industries have also been started and they will occupy a more prominent place in the future plans.

It is said that since Russia had no previous experience in planning, the targets fixed by the First Plan could not be reached. Still, even during the Fifth Five-Year Plan (1951-55), to quote Marshal Nikolai Bulganin from his reported speech of July 4, 1955, to the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, "more than one third of all enterprises have not fulfilled the task set for them by the State." The Russian Prime Minister further admitted that "many enterprises produced goods of a low quality and that in 1954 the coal industry delivered coal containing nearly 2 per cent. slag which disturbed consumers and wasted transport facilities." Even the plans to reduce the cost of production, Marshal Bulganin frankly confessed, had not been fulfilled in more than half of the industrial enterprises, belonging to the All-Union Administration during the past two years, and that the failure to fulfil the plan, cost Russia about 857 million pounds during 1951.

It may also be mentioned that in spite of the fact that Russia has abolished the system of private property and nationalised all means of production and distribution, the gulf between the low and high incomes has not been completely bridged. Some political observers maintain that the income differential is still of the order of one to eighty in many professions. Be that as it may, the hard fact remains that the true Marxian economic equality has not

COMPARISON WITHOUT CRITICISM

been established as yet. All the same, it must be said to the credit of Russia that there is no unemployment in the land, and that labour is well paid and many amenities which make life comfortable are provided for the workers.

II

AS regards China, after a prolonged Civil War extending over 30 years, it entered a period of rebuilding a shattered economy. Its First Five-Year Plan is now running in its third year. The stress has been on industrial expansion at the cost of consumer goods. Yet, China has not shown results which India has, in the case of many commodities. According to the recent findings of Mr. Wuan-lewu and Mr. Robert C. North, members of the Stanford University's Department of Asian and Slavic studies, "so far the more rapid pace of industrialisation in China has not been able to rival India's present stage of development on *per capita* basis, even within the industrial sector in which China has concentrated its investment programme." On the basis of results in 1954, the expert analysts have drawn the following eloquent conclusions:

(1) "Consumption per person in India has improved during the past five years; that of China has deteriorated. This is because India has chosen a slower rate of capital development than China.

(2) India's development programme is diversified, while China is concentrating on heavy industry. This has led to impressive gains in agricultural production in India, while production has developed adversely in China.

(3) Forced labour is the mainstay of China's industrialisation, but India has avoided that method."

The fact that all the great industries set up by Japan in North-West China and Manchuria, are now under the control of the Government of the Chinese People's Republic, should also be borne in mind, when taking stock of China's industrial progress. It is the opinion of many impartial and objective observers, who have been to China, that she "will take at least ten years more to come upto the level of India." This is no reflection on China, as India, even if she has a predominantly agricultural economy, is the eighth among industrially advanced countries in the world.

The impression that communist China has refashioned its economic structure completely on socialistic lines is not correct. The system of individual proprietorship in land still prevails. In point of fact, the Agrarian Reform Law specially provides that "land and other properties of the middle peasants (including well-to-do middle peasants) shall be protected from infringement." Of course, many radical reforms in the agrarian system have rescued

the peasantry from the iron heel of feudal lords, and more than 11 crore acres of land have been re-distributed to the actual tillers. And so far as the industrial sector is concerned, nearly 80 per cent. of the trade capital is comprised of private capital enterprise. Nevertheless, the State sector in industry is getting a more dominant place. Since land as yet has not been taken over by the Government, and private enterprise is still an integral part of the economic organisation, it is admitted by top Chinese leaders that "not before 15 to 20 years to come will China be able to lay the foundations of a Socialist State." This clearly shows that planning with an authoritarian bias does not necessarily yield results quicker than peaceful democratic methods. All the same, it cannot be denied that China has accomplished much, and is also marching from progress to progress in various phases of national life. Even Mr. James Cameron, who recently wrote a highly critical book of Chinese regime, called *Mandarin Red*, recognises the fact that the emancipation of women is one of the greatest achievements of the Chinese Revolution.

III

A FEW observations on the progress of Russia and China vis-a-vis India's achievements have been made not to cast any aspersions on the two great countries, or to boost what India has attained. These brief comparisons are meant for those sceptics whose profession is to run down India, and to glorify other countries. Moreover, success of any undertaking can never be judged from an absolute point of view. Comparisons made in a healthy spirit present a true perspective of the results actually realised. And if the results, after a critical study are found to be good, they create further hope and expectancy in the nation. Although, the political and economic systems of Russia and China, are basically different from ours and their totalitarian methods for social changes are fundamentally opposed to our democratic ways, yet there is so much that we can learn from these two great countries, for they too are occupied in the mighty enterprise of building up an egalitarian society. If we refuse to bind ourselves to some predetermined social theories, it is because India is pragmatic and not dogmatic, either in thought or in action. Our minds are open to the flow of progressive ideas; it matters little from which country they emanate. We are ready to accept what is good in the system of any country. While we are keen to benefit from the experience of other nations to recreate the present social organism, it must be frankly stated that we prefer to do things in our own way. Let those persons who feel that only through the Marxian way

COMPARISON WITHOUT CRITICISM

the living conditions of the people can be improved, remember the words of wisdom of our Prime Minister that "it is no use imitating other countries and peoples. It never pays to imitate because imitation leads to weakness and dependence on others." India's methods of solving her problems are unique, for we have a genuine peaceful and democratic approach. The success of these methods in reshaping the economic framework so as to provide social justice to all, will set an example to other Asian countries engaged in the task of emancipating their people from the bondage of gross inequalities and suffering.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

DANGER TO DEMOCRACY

*All Nature seems at work, slugs leave their lair—
The bees are stirring—birds are on the wing,
And Winter, slumbering in the open air,
Wears on his smiling face a dream of Spring
And I the while, the sole unbusy thing,
Nor honey make, nor pair, nor build, nor sing.*

—S.T. COLERIDGE: WORK WITHOUT HOPE

PRODUCTION, both in the agricultural and in the industrial sectors, has been increasing during the last few years. In fact, most of the targets prescribed by the First Five-Year Plan, have been touched. However, this increase in production, coupled with an increase in unemployment, illustrates the anamoly of capitalism. The magnitude of unemployment, outpacing the increase of production, means that there has been no appreciable rise in the national *per capita* income. It also means that the pattern of disparities, in terms of wealth as purchasing power, has remained almost the same. This state of affairs, is obviously, inconsistent with the concept of welfare economics. To remove this social maladjustment, India has decided to reconstruct the economic fabric on socialistic lines.

Formerly, the emphasis was on more production, for the reason that the country was in the grip of all sorts of scarcities, and the people suffered from the rigours of irksome controls. But now in the new social scheme, the emphasis has shifted to employment because production *per se* without effective demand does not raise the living standards of the people. Precisely, the place that food crisis occupied in our economic planning four years ago, has now been taken up by the problem of unemployment.

Bertrand Russel, in his book *Principles of Social Reconstruction*, has laid down four fundamental tests by which the social basis of an economic system could be judged. They are : "Whether the system secures (1) maximum production, (2) justice in distribution, (3) a tolerable existence for producers, and (4) the greatest possible freedom and stimulus to vitality and progress." He has not mentioned the provision of employment, since idleness is not such a social problem in the West, as it is in India. In our country, the creation of employment opportunities is a moral necessity, inasmuch as it is only through full employment that equitable

DANGER TO DEMOCRACY

distribution of national wealth can be ensured. In other words, greater production through fuller employment, is the only way of reducing the income differential and thereby laying the foundation of an egalitarian society. Such a society will draw its life-breath from the masses, as they all will be co-operating in transforming the social and economic fabric of the country. This sense of partnership will make them interested in social stability. An unemployed person can never have the feeling of emotional intergration with his country. "An empty stomach," Einstein appropriately observed in *Cosmic Religion*, "is not a good political adviser." Unemployment works as a disruptive force, and if not checked in time, it becomes a social danger to the Government itself. For instance, the Weimar Constitution in Germany broke down, because the problem of unemployment could not be adequately tackled. That is why the resolution on the socialistic pattern of society categorically avows that full employment must be provided within ten years.

II

THE problem of unemployment is not a sudden development. For many decades, it has been the dominant feature of Indian economy. Many years ago, at one of the International Labour Conferences, the Indian representative in reply to a question whether India maintained any unemployment statistics replied that "it would be easier to maintain employment statistics." This remark shows that the problem has been lying hidden in society. But the growing awareness of social ideals of political democracy has brought it to the surface. And, with the increase in unemployment among the educated classes, the problem has now assumed greater gravity. This is so, because being vocal, they can make their grievance felt. Moreover, it must be remembered that the legions of the unemployed in our rural areas, are fast becoming politically conscious, and when they become vocal, it will not be easy to control the forces of discontent that will be let loose. For no man, as Mr. W.C. Brann pointedly said, "can be a patriot on an empty stomach." If the problem of unemployment did not exist previously, Article 39 asking the State to see "that all the citizens, men and women equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood," and Article 43 asking the State "to secure by suitable legislation, or economic organisation, or in any other way, to all workers, agricultural, industrial or otherwise, work, a living wage, conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life and full enjoyment of leisure and social and cultural opportunities," would not have been incorporated in our Constitution. Further, the

Congress has time and again declared that "the aim of a Welfare State is to provide full employment," and that "in a Welfare State there should be practically no unemployment, and opportunities for work should be available to those who desire it."

The problem of unemployment has been in existence, not because people did not want to do any work, but because there was no work for them to do. The work was not provided, as the foreign rulers were not interested in developing the country. That is why the country has remained economically under-developed and socially backward. But to-day there is so much to do in every sphere and the people are most willing to shoulder the job. Hence, there should be no unemployment. In the final analysis, it is nothing but a question of mobilising the material and human resources in a proper manner with a view to pursuing a multi-front programme of economic regeneration. For that reason the issue of eradicating unemployment has been given the foremost place in national planning. If people remain starving, mere high ideals of a socialistic society will just have no meaning to them. In fact, the danger is that they might become subversive. The distinguished Roman philosopher, Annae's Seneca, was certainly right when he said: "A hungry people listens not to reason, nor cares for justice."

Every man has the inherent right to earning his livelihood through productive work. As a matter of fact, in a socialistic society every citizen should be given that kind of work in which he feels temperamentally interested. The reason being that unless the mental capacities are fully utilized, conditions for the elevation of human personality cannot be created. The raising of the moral status of a people is imperative because, as Bacon puts it, "the true greatness consists essentially in population and breed of men." Work should not be considered as a mere means of earning one's livelihood. It has a specific purpose in the development of man's character. Still, during this period of reorganising the economic and industrial pattern of the country, people shall have to be satisfied even with manual work. Nehru makes it quite clear that "if the educated young men do not accept manual work, then our responsibility of providing employment to them ceases." Work is indivisible, and it should not be classified into socially respectable and menial, as it is ordinarily. Honour lies in honest toil. "The crowning fortune of a man," Emerson tells us, "is to be born to some pursuit which finds him employment and happiness, whether it be to make baskets, or broadswords, or canals, or statues, or songs."

Unemployment not only stabs the stomach, but degrades the man spiritually too. It upsets one's morale, and social morale is essential for the smooth functioning of any State. With that

consciousness, every enlightened State regards it as its fundamental duty to create conditions for the gainful occupation of its people. So great is the importance of this social question, that Roosevelt went to the extent of saying that "the very soundness of our democratic institutions depends on the determination of our Government to give employment to idle men." In case the State fails to provide work, it gives to the unemployed a minimum subsistence allowance. Admittedly, doles keep body and soul together. Nevertheless, they have a demoralizing effect and debase human personality. Therefore, in the proposed socialistic society, which aims at raising the stature of man, work instead of doles is to be provided. Categorically rejecting the practice of maintaining idle hands at State expense, the Prime Minister declares : "I do not believe in giving doles to the unemployed ; it is entirely a wrong policy. We should plan to give work rather than doles." It may be mentioned here that some financial relief, in one form or the other, used to be given to persons in acute distress, even in the earliest days of human civilization. However, from the ethical point of view, it was never looked upon with favour. For instance, Demosthenes, the celebrated Greek orator, likened the distribution of doles to "the diet prescribed by doctors, which does not restore the strength of the patient." Those who advocate supporting the unemployed on State aid should remember the words of Mr. Alfred Crowquill. The English writer holds that "the bread earned by the sweat of the brow, is thrice blessed bread, and it is far sweeter than the tasteless loaf of idleness." Although, our Government is not distributing doles to the jobless, the society by furnishing them with food, shelter and clothes, is certainly giving doles in an indirect manner. Consequently, the collective resources of the community are being depleted to sustain the non-earning dependents. Thus, a large amount of capital is being eaten away by the unemployed, without adding anything to the common pool of social wealth. That explains why Bernard Shaw has affirmatively laid down that people have no right to consume wealth without producing it.

The plea that there is shortage of money to employ the jobless millions does not hold good. The present state of affairs only shows that we have not properly canalised the working capacity of the people, and the social resources of the country. So, the question of ensuring work to the people is nothing but a matter of planning.

It should always be borne in mind that the problem of unemployment in India, is unique in a way. It is a big country, heavily populated and under-developed. Our problem does not bear any comparison with Western countries. Here the problem is neither residual nor frictional. It is a grim part of Indian life, assuming various forms—potential, disguised, visible, chronic, and even seaso-

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

nal; some of which are even difficult to measure. As such, our ways of handling the problem shall have to be different. In this respect, Carlos P. Romulo's words have significance that "you cannot assume that a policy which works satisfactorily in Europe will work equally well in Asia and Africa." Of course, the experience of other countries can help us in finding the appropriate solution.

Since the grim problem of unemployment can only be tackled through proper planning, it is of utmost importance that we should have complete facts and accurate figures about the extent of unemployment and under-employment in the country. Opinions to-day differ about the magnitude of the problem because no reliable statistics are available. Some enquiries in certain parts of the country have been conducted on a sampling basis. Still, they do not give an accurate data for planning in definite terms. And facts, as T. G. Smollet, the 18th century English novelist, put it "are stubborn things." Planning without facts can never yield the desired social results. Therefore, the necessity of conducting a comprehensive and scientific unemployment survey becomes all the more urgent.

III

SOME rough idea of the extent and nature of unemployment can be had by studying the Employment Exchange statistics. During the last three years, the figure has been constantly rising by about 20 per cent. Since all persons do not get registered with the Employment Exchanges, the exact figures of the jobless cannot be estimated. Moreover, these exchanges function only in some of the big cities. Hence, the over-all picture of the unemployment situation in the country cannot be furnished by them. And, so far as the problem of partial unemployment is concerned—which pursues all under-developed countries—its immensity can never be found through the Employment Exchanges. Further, the problem of unemployment is not merely confined to the "totally unemployed" or the "partially unemployed." From the standpoint of true social democracy, unemployment has a wider connotation, for in the words of Socrates, "a person is not only idle who does nothing, but he is also idle who might be better employed."

Notwithstanding, the limited sphere within which our Employment Exchanges are working, it must be said to their credit that they are performing a useful function in alleviating, in some measure, the distress of unemployment by bringing the employer and the needy man together. Statistical tables clearly show that more and more people are getting new jobs through the mecha-

DANGER TO DEMOCRACY

nism of these Exchanges. A reorientation, however, in the policy of the Employment Exchanges is needed to meet present social requirements. First, every employer must be put under a statutory obligation to fill the vacancy only through an Employment Exchange. Secondly, a network of Employment Exchanges should be created throughout the country to enable people even in small towns to make use of this socially beneficial institution. In this respect, it is heartening to note, as pointed out by the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan, that "the scope of Employment Exchanges is being enlarged, so that they also become agencies for collecting employment market information, thereby rendering valuable assistance in the implementation of plans for increased employment. The number of Employment Exchanges is to be increased from 131 to 256 during the Second Plan period." A nationwide growth of employment agencies will greatly help in the reorganisation of labour market by creating a liaison between the employer and the prospective employee. At present, as Mr. Jagjivan Ram, the Union Minister for Communications, has said, "the unemployed being glued to their misery, there is no mobility of labour." As a result of this staticness, quite often jobs lie vacant, yet, the people requiring those jobs know nothing about them. Thus, while at one end production suffers, as the strength of available manpower is not upto requirement, at the other end unemployment continues, because labour has no information about these vacant jobs. Employment Exchanges, if properly organised all over the country would appreciably help in realisation of the socialistic objective of Maximum Production plus Full Employment.

CHAPTER TWENTY

FIGURES THAT FRIGHTEN

*The burden of long living,
Thou shalt fear
Waking, and sleeping mourn upon thy bed;
And say at night: "Would God the day were here."
And say at dawn: "Would God the day were dead."*

—A.C. SWINBURNE: A BALLAD OF BURDENS.

ALTHOUGH no comprehensive study of the unemployment problem has been undertaken, some statistics published by the Census Commission, the Agricultural Labour Enquiry and the All-India Khadi and Village Industries Board, give us a general idea of its magnitude. A perusal of these facts and figures, reveals certain dangerous trends in the economy of India, and also quicken the realisation that effective steps shall have to be taken, if the social structure has to be saved from collapsing. There is so much of disequilibrium in the country's occupational pattern, that unless a poised occupational balance in the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors is achieved, our national economy will not rest on strong foundations. Constancy in the social system is essential because no Government, to quote Mr. Leon Blum, "can remain stable in an unstable society."

The first thing that causes anxiety is, that even though we have been making progress in all economic spheres during the last fifty years, the number of non-working dependents has been increasing, and that of workers falling. The table below gives the startling information :—

Year	Workers	Non-Working Dependents
1901	103,393,798 (50·1)	103,261,453 (49·9)
1911	125,546,689 (49·6)	127,792,722 (50·4)
1921	122,668,900 (48·6)	129,492,270 (51·4)
1931	129,699,063 (47·0)	146,541,147 (53·0)
1951	142,337,038 (39·9)	214,291,274 (60·1)

It may also be noted, that the proportion of workers has

FIGURES THAT FRIGHTEN

been falling, both in the agricultural and non-agricultural sectors. Relevant figures given in the following table are eloquent.

Year	Agricultural Sector Workers	Non-Agricultural Sector Workers
1901	64,450,763 (31.2)	39,143,035 (18.9)
1911	87,197,194 (34.5)	38,349,495 (15.1)
1921	83,885,145 (33.2)	38,783,755 (15.4)
1931	80,729,081 (29.2)	48,969,982 (17.8)
1951	102,118,261 (28.6)	40,218,777 (11.3)

It will be erroneous to presume that the persons classed as "workers" are all self-supporters. Some of them earn, but not enough to support themselves completely. Out of this percentage of 39.9 of the workers, only 29.3 per cent. are self-supporters and the remaining 10.6 per cent. are earning dependents. Thus, out of the total population of 35.6 crores, the number of self-supporting persons is 10.4 crores, and that of the earning dependents is 3.8 crores, while that of the non-earning dependents is 21.4 crores. This means that every 1000 self-supporting persons have to support 2,500 other persons. The acute gravity of these figures can be judged from the fact, that in England and America, the number of non-earning dependents per thousand is 1,207 and 1,547 respectively. In other words, every self-supporting Indian has to support fully two non-working dependents, and one among the three self-supporters, has also to support one earning dependent partially. In the main, it is these non-earners and earning dependents who constitute the problem of unemployment in the country. They also adversely affect the living conditions of the people gainfully employed. Assuming, on a conservative basis, that out of every 3 persons one is a working adult, full employment has to be provided to 7.1 crores (their number being 21.4 crores) and partial employment to 1.2 crores (their number being 3.8 crores). But that is not all. The population is constantly increasing at an average rate of 1.3 per cent. per annum. In other words, as stated by the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan, "the population of India is increasing at the rate of 4.5 to 5 million every year." Provision, therefore, has to be made for about 18 lakh new entrants too, every year to the working population. The pressure of population can be gauged from the fact, that whereas the population in 1901, was only 20.6 crores, in 1951, it rose to 35.6 crores. And according, to the calculations of the latest Census Report, the

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

country's population is expected to be in the neighbourhood of 56 crores in 1981 !

II

YET another factor that causes anxiety is that the pressure on land has been continuously increasing, and rendering our agriculture uneconomic. While in 1901, the number of persons who depended for their subsistence on land was just 16 crores, in 1951, (in fifty years) it rose to 24.9 crores. Thus the number of persons, who derive their livelihood from non-agricultural occupations, is only 10.7 crores. In other words, 69.8 per cent. of the people depend on the land and only 30.2 per cent. on non-agricultural occupations. Analysing the economic status of the rural population, we find that 39 per cent. are landless labourers, 28 per cent. are tenants and the remaining 33 per cent. possess land. It has also been estimated topographically, that the entire usable land comes to about 50 crore acres out of the total land area of 81 crore acres. This figure has been arrived at after assuming that all the fallow and waste land has been brought under cultivation. Agricultural experts have calculated that 50 crore acres can, at the maximum, gainfully support 12.6 crore people. In order, therefore, to make agriculture a profitable vocation, 12.3 crore of people have to be diverted from land to industry.

Calculating on the basis that out of every 3 persons one is a working adult, work shall have to be provided to 4.1 crores in the non-agricultural sector. In case that is not done, with an increase in the population every year, the pressure on the land will become more acute, and the size of holdings will be lesser. And if things are allowed to drift, the number of dependents on agriculture in 1981, is likely to be nearly 39 crores, out of the total estimated population of 56 crores. This will happen, as the percentage of population depending on the land, has more or less, remained constant at about 70 per cent. during the last fifty years. Sub-division and fragmentation of holdings, in turn, will adversely affect agricultural production, unless well-organised co-operative farms are established, and scientific intensive methods of cultivation introduced. But intensive methods, too, have their limitations. "Even measures aimed at raising the intensity of agricultural operations," Prof. D.N. Nag aptly points out, "at their best, can only be expected to remove seasonal, or under-employment, among the cultivators themselves." Admittedly, disguised unemployment can be removed by raising productivity per acre, because the actual tiller will be able to support himself fully. Yet, the problem of those, who are non-working dependents will continue, in spite

FIGURES THAT FRIGHTEN

of increased production. They may have a little more to eat. Still, their unemployment as such will remain.

The seriousness of the occupational maladjustment of 69.8 per cent. in the rural sector, and 30.2 per cent. in the urban sector, becomes all the more alarming, when the occupational distribution in India is compared with that of some advanced countries. The following table gives the comparative figures, in respect of different occupations per every 1000 persons in India, U.S.A. and Great Britain:

	India	U.S.A.	Great Britain
Agriculture, animal husbandry and fishing	706	128	50
Mining, manufacturing and commerce	153	456	555
Other industries and services	141	416	395
	<hr/> 1000 <hr/>	<hr/> 1000 <hr/>	<hr/> 1000 <hr/>

Commenting on the character of this occupational distribution, the Census Report says, "that these differences in categories, other than food production, mark the distinction between affluence and poverty." And, it is because of this unbalance in agricultural and non-agricultural sectors, that the general disparity in incomes continues to be unconscionably high. According to Prof. Gadgil, the range of income differentiation in India is much wider than in most of the Western countries.

III

IT is self-evident, that far-reaching adjustments shall have to be made in agriculture and industry, if we are to have a progressive balanced economy. The employment potential of agriculture being already heavily strained, the land cannot furnish sustenance to more people. Therefore, a countrywide development of the industrial sector remains the only hope of the hungry and nothing-to-do. And, as Mr. Vaikunth L. Mehta, the well-known Gandhian economist, says: "It is extremely doubtful if the spectre of unemployment can be laid at rest, unless we provide on an organised systematic basis, and on a nationwide scale, employment in the rural areas, partly in part time occupations, and partly in full time industries."

Inasmuch as village is the pivot around which Indian economy revolves, it is imperative that the social and economic fibre of villages should be strong. The importance of the rural sector can be appreciated by the fact, that "half the national product of India is contributed by agriculture, animal husbandry, and

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

allied activities." The table below gives the respective contributions by different sources of livelihood.

Activity			(Crores of Rupees) Net Product
1.	Agriculture, animal husbandry and ancillary activities	..	4,780
2.	Forestry and fishery	..	110
3.	Mining	70
4.	Factory establishment and small enterprise	..	1,460
5.	Commerce, transport and communication	1,690
6.	Other services	1,440
Total			<hr/> 9,550 <hr/>

From the above factual statement, it is obvious that even a slight rise in the purchasing power of the rural people, will tend to activate the urban economic sector. If the *per capita* income of the rural masses is not increased by giving them employment, national living standards will continue to be low, and the socialistic ideal of reducing income and wealth disparities will just remain a distant dream.

CHAPTER TWENTY-ONE

PRODUCTION BY THE PEOPLE

So long as all the increased wealth which modern progress brings, goes but to build up great fortunes, to increase luxury, and make sharper the contest between the House of Have and the House of Want, progress is not real and cannot be permanent.

—HENRY GEORGE: PROGRESS AND POVERTY

PRODUCTION in a socialistic economy should be so planned that it ensures maximum social justice and equitable distribution of wealth as well. During the last few decades, magnificent development in the industrial sector has taken place. Still, by and large, the economic conditions of the people have not improved in proportion to the industrial progress. This irksome contradiction is due to the fact, that with the increase in output, the purchasing power of the masses has not risen. The purchasing power of the people can be raised if the circulation of money is very extensive. This will only happen if in the process of increasing production, they are given full opportunities of employment. To increase production, at the cost of the misery of the masses, is nothing short of an unsocial act. In the new egalitarian society, wealth must be produced for the benefit of the common folk, and business magnates have to revise their conception about profit margins and legitimate surplus. Their values and attitudes must also undergo a radical change. In fact, as Mill following Comte, laid down: "Every person who lives by any useful work should be habituated to regard himself not as an individual working for his private benefit, but as a public functionary."

The social objective of a planned economy, is the welfare of man. Hence, that kind of production alone will advance the cause of social justice in which the largest number of people participate. India's material and man-power resources are so vast that if they are judiciously employed, economic distinctions can be removed in a systematic manner, without creating any social upheavals. Still, precious human resources have just been wasted, and the material ones have not been utilized in pursuance of any social policy. All this has enabled the limited few to amass wealth at the cost of many. Of course, some social benefits do trickle down to the people. But, with our pledge to establish an equalitarian social order, such schemes of industrial development

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

have to be projected which do good to society as a whole. Then alone, poverty, hunger and want will be eliminated from the social system.

II

THE protagonists of big industries tell us, that the solution for the economic ills of India, lies in the total mechanization of the instruments of production. In support of this contention, they cite the dazzling progress that some of the Western countries have made through large-scale production. Indeed, they affirm that social advance is intimately associated with the expansion of big industries. But in their enthusiasm to propagate the cause of industrialisation, they forget that the conditions in India, are totally dissimilar to those of Western countries. And, as Mr. Grover Cleveland, the former U.S. President, has stated: "It is the condition which confronts us—not the theory." The geography and the history of our country is different, and so are the religious traditions and cultural values of our people. In consequence, the pattern of our economy must be different. In the West, labour being scarce and dear, labour-saving machines are required to increase production. But, in India, labour being abundant and cheap, the use of labour-killing devices will further aggravate unemployment, which has already become a tremendous social menace. What we, in reality, need is labour-absorbing machines which will not in any way displace the hands already working, but assist them in adding to their *per capita* productivity. "It is only through a decentralised pattern of production," the Union Finance Minister, Mr. C.D. Deshmukh, declares, "that employment opportunities, on a scale commensurate with the needs of the population, can be secured." For the benefit of those who advocate total industrialisation, it may be mentioned that even America, with its sparse population and abundant capital, has not been able to provide employment to all the people through a mechanized pattern of production. It has been authoritatively stated that even to-day about 37 lakhs of people have to be maintained by the Government as unemployed labour. Mr. T.K. Quin, an American industrialist, realising the gross limitations of big industry, suggests in his book, *Giant Business: Threat to Democracy*, that "huge combines should be decentralised and the Government assistance to small industries must become a matter of public policy." Considering the peculiar character of Indian conditions, the objective of increasing production, and at the same time providing employment to millions, cannot be achieved through large-scale industrialisation, but by decentralising the means of production in the form of small-scale industries. Indeed, large-scale development of small industries is most essential to our future

PRODUCTION BY THE PEOPLE

growth and present social well-being. Capital goods industries, however, have to be organised on a large scale because decentralisation of such industries is just impossible. Moreover, they feed small units with improved tools, without which cottage production cannot become efficient. Key industries give a firm base to a nation's economy.

The supporters of large-scale industries, tauntingly say, that a dispersed pattern of industrialism is just "a Gandhian fad" and will take the country back to medieval times. Such remarks are understandable because decentralisation of economic power leaves little scope for amassing wealth by exploiting others. Even hardboiled economic experts, who in the past ridiculed the very concept of economic diversification, when confronted with the task of achieving the social aims of economic planning, have been forced to come to the conclusion that the problem of unemployment and partial unemployment, can only be solved by expanding the small-scale industries sector. When business chiefs are asked to produce a concrete plan to provide countrywide employment through mechanized industry, they retort that "the standard of living of the people can only be raised by mass production at reduced cost." But they fail to remember that unless the people are provided with the requisite purchasing power to buy goods that are produced, their economic status will remain just the same, in spite of the abundance of commodities. The employment potential of large-scale industries being restricted, mass production and increase in the volume of employment, do not go hand in hand. It cannot be denied that while the number of industries has increased, there has been no corresponding increase in the industrially occupied people. Whatever good the big industries might have done to India, they have not been helpful in solving the unemployment problem. Moreover, the contribution to the national income by large-scale industries is Rs. 550 crores, and by small enterprises Rs. 910 crores. The number of persons employed by small-scale industries is over 2 crores and by the big industries about 30 lakhs. Of course, the *per capita* income of these self-employed persons is small. They have meagre resources; and under the stress of competition with organised industries, they are unable to find enough work all the year round.

Yet, it should not be forgotten that an unemployed person is a burden on the community. He consumes something without producing anything. Therefore, it is of paramount importance that he should produce something, and it matters little if he cannot produce as much as the machine. Needless to emphasize, the cottage industry method of production, which enables him to produce something, should be welcomed, instead of being derided as a relic of primitive age. Fundamentally, what matters is work

and not its technique, or productive potentialities. No wonder, Carlyle says: "Blessed is he who has found his work; let him ask no other blessedness." Since social happiness is the primary concern of welfare economics, employment should be considered as relatively more important than production. Of course, both are important. Still, production which is in conflict with employment, can have no place in our socialistic economy, because such a scheme of production will not, in any way, ensure equitable distribution of wealth. Let it be categorically stated that if there is a choice between "idle hands" and "idle machines", India will any day prefer "idle machines" to "idle hands." Obviously, man is much more important than machine. The machine must be a source of help and not a means of displacing human labour. The greatest task before civilization at present, emphasizes Havelock Ellis, in *Little Essays of Love and Virtue*, is to make machines what they ought to be, the slaves, instead of the masters of men.

Large-scale production will not solve the problem of mass unemployment, as by employing a few, it displaces many working already. It is only production on the largest scale, through small industries that can remove poverty and hunger, because millions of men and women can be absorbed thus. Broadening of incentives and initiatives will unleash dynamic social forces, and people's creative faculties will be harnessed into building a new social order in which man's material, moral and cultural stature will grow in peace and harmony. The total development of human personality is essential, as in the words of Herbert Spencer, "the Republican form of Government requires the highest type of human nature." Therefore, the occupational pattern in our country should be recast to enlarge and diversify employment opportunities. Indeed, what is needed is not mass production but production by the masses. In this respect, we can profitably learn from the ingenious industrial structure built by Japan. There, 54 per cent. of small industries are one man workshops, and 40 per cent. establishments employ less than five workers. The remaining six per cent. are large-scale industries. Almost every house has an industry; it is a factory during the day and home at night.

Even in some of the European countries, small-scale industries play an important role in stepping up production. These little units of production work as a team, because the relationship between the small entrepreneur, and workers drawn from local inhabitants, is cordial. It is also worth noting that these middle industries admirably stood the shock of 1929-30 economic shake-up, while most of the large-scale establishments, with their tight organisational methods, just collapsed.

III

IT is argued that since cottage industry goods are dearer than those produced by the mechanized units, they are not likely to be purchased by the people. There is some force in this contention. But for larger social interests, we shall have to make a small sacrifice. By paying a little more, we help in increasing the income of so many families engaged in small establishments, as the difference in the cost of production is mainly due to the difference in the number of persons employed. The extra price we pay goes directly into the empty pockets of millions. The distress of poverty, the poor alone know. "There is nothing so degrading," declares Somerset Maugham, in his world famous novel, *On Human Bondage*, "as the constant anxiety about one's means of livelihood. Money is like a sixth sense, without which you cannot make a complete use of the other five."

It should not be forgotten that though the cost of mechanized production is small, yet the social costs in the form of mental torture and moral degradation, which are caused by displacement of labour by modern machines, are tremendous. Rightly has George Leibig, the German Textile expert, said: "There are many wrong ways of cheapening the cost of an industrial product which create more problems than they solve." In the new socialistic society, social security for the man producing goods, must have precedence over the cost of his product. Cottage industries should not be measured by the yardstick of classical economics. They are healthy means of production and give an opportunity for creative work. Personality of the artisan grows, instead of remaining stunted, as usually happens in the case of industrial workers. The drudgery and monotony of specialization in industry has even been recognised by the champions of economic centralisation. "Constant labour of one uniform kind," Karl Marx states in *The Capital*, "destroys the intensity and flow of a man's spirits, which find recreation and delight in mere change of activity."

The urban people, who have so far lived at the cost of villages, should act upto the advice of Nehru i.e., "we should encourage our small-scale and cottage industries, even though their products may be dearer and cruder for the time being. Anything that comes from abroad is more expensive than anything produced by Indian labour, although it may cost ten times more." Cottage industries cannot be developed by mere expression of sympathies. They have to be nursed with care, love and affection. Our social values should change, if we are sincere in establishing a socialistic society. Individual greed must yield place to love for humanity, and selfishness must make way for spirit of

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

sacrifice. Self-sacrificing attitude alone will make us discharge our duty to the artisan, whose life has been a burden of want, misery and hunger. To-day, the Indian artisan is, what Roosevelt once described as "the forgotten man at the bottom of the economic pyramid." By patronizing the products of small industries, we shall advance the cause of social justice to the vast countryside, and thus lay the foundation of a humanitarian-democratic social order.

IV

APART from the ethical and emotional considerations, there are other economic aspects which have impelled the Indian planners to ascribe a positive role to small units of production, in the socialist pattern of economy. The understanding of these factors is essential, for, then alone, our approach to the development of cottage industries will be dynamic. Since our attitude towards small industries has been static, they have been languishing before our eyes, even though the Planning Commission in the First Five-Year Plan had made specific recommendations for their rapid development. Indeed, it had laid down that "the Central Government must now give the same attention to the village and small-scale industries, as it has undertaken, in view of the shortage of food and raw materials, to give to agriculture." But now with our pledge to establish a socialistic structure of society, in the Second Five-Year Plan, the promotion of cottage industries has become a matter of social duty. Below are given the considerations, which have moved the economists towards giving high importance to the revival of cottage industries. All these considerations are based on the actuality of conditions that obtain in India. No industrialist, who wishes India well, can afford to ignore them. And, as Mr. John Tyndall, observes in *Fragments of Science*: "It is as fatal as it is cowardly to blink facts, because they are not to our taste."

(1) It has been estimated that whereas only a few hundred rupees are required to provide employment to one person in a small industry, it costs more than three thousand rupees to settle him in the organised sector. This huge discrepancy is due to the fact that technical devices used in big industries are capital intensive, and those employed in small establishments are labour intensive. The employment potential of large-scale industry being limited, the total investment required to give employment through them would run into astronomical figures. As it is, with an investment of over Rs. 1,500 crores in big industries, they are employing about 30 lakhs of labour force. And, the return on

PRODUCTION BY THE PEOPLE

the capital invested in large industries comes after some time, because the larger the unit the longer it takes to master its profit-earning technique. Thus, for the first few years, there is no appreciable cheapening of the cost of the product, and consequently, no raising of the living standards. But, in the case of cottage industries, there is immediate yield on investment.

Since India's capital resources are very meagre, a country-wide plan to provide employment to millions through large-scale industrialization, is illogical, to say the least. Our "real national capital" is man-power which is lying idle. "The wealth of a nation," the well-known American poet, Richard Hovey, has said pithily, "is men, not merely silk and cotton and gold." The vast potentiality of India's real capital can be judged from the fact that in the total population of 35,66 lakhs, the number of non-earning dependents is 21,43 lakhs, and the number of those who are partially earning is 38 lakhs. Of course, these figures include the aged and the children. After excluding them, it is estimated that the number of idle hands is in the neighbourhood of 9,00 lakhs. Instead of searching for capital to industrialize the country, this immense human capital should be properly mobilized for productive purposes. An economic organisation created on these lines, will simultaneously raise production, increase employment and ensure equitable distribution of wealth—the three social objectives of socialised economics.

(2) Even if capital could be found for investment in big factories, the problem of finding extensive markets to sell goods produced on a mass scale would arise. The Western countries had colonies in the under-developed regions to dump their goods. But India, having no imperial designs, just cannot think in terms of capturing foreign lands. These countries, as Mr. U.N. Dhebar has said, "had other advantages and had followed other methods, which India cannot hope to have, or to copy." Besides, there are no lands to be captured. In fact, many of those held in subjection are being freed. So we have to depend on our domestic market.

(3) For large-scale industrialization, mechanical units have to be imported. This will naturally put a heavy strain on our foreign exchange resources. To meet foreign payments, we shall have to export raw materials, and that too, most probably, at cheaper prices. Needless to say, this will adversely hit the numerous primary producers, and their living standards, instead of being raised, will be lowered. Small-scale industries present no such problem of importing machinery, because they can be easily run by tools and implements manufactured locally. Only for improving the productive capacity of small units, improved implements may have to be supplied. To manufacture these implements, heavy industries shall have to be installed, and the requisite machinery imported.

But these heavy industries pay rich social dividends in the long run.

(4) As India has a predominantly agrarian economy and its population is diversified, centralized technique of production is hardly the right solution for our peculiar social problems. On the other hand, agro-industries are eminently suited to India's peculiar economy, because in the rural setting, they provide ready employment to a vast number of people at their very doors, and thereby, they arrest the depopulation of villages. One way traffic from the rural to the urban areas has already created many social, economic and moral problems in our congested cities. Moreover, it should not be forgotten, as aptly pointed out by Havellock Ellis, in his book, *The Task of Social Hygiene*, that "the larger our great cities grow, the more irresistible becomes the attraction which they exert on the children of the country, who are fascinated by them, as the birds are fascinated by the lighthouse, or the moths by the candle." It is of utmost importance that further movement towards the towns must be checked, and a balance in the social and economic life of the country maintained. In this respect, the Karve Committee, set up by the Planning Commission, in its report says: "A realisation of the essential superiority of the small and the medium-sized town, as a centre of socio-economic life in an egalitarian democracy, would emphasize the need of a reorientation of our attitude towards the further growth of some of the large cities."

If both individual and economic freedom of the artisan is to be ensured and labour-capital conflicts—the inevitable resultant of a centralized pattern of production—are to be avoided, small and cottage industries where the wage-earners and owners of the means of production are the same, must be encouraged. In planning for more production, an agricultural country like India must draw inspiration from the occupational pattern of villages, and not look for guidance to the industrialized cities of Europe. Then alone we shall be able to activate the social base, and generate a new spirit of reconstruction in every nook and corner of India, which will be a tremendous contribution towards the economic progress of our country.

(5) From the standpoint of national defence, small-scale and cottage industries have an importance of their own. Being spread out all over the land, they do not become easy targets of aerial bombing. China was able to resist the Japanese aggression because the net-work of Indusco Co-operatives served as a second line of defence. Due to the fear of atomic warfare, even countries like America and England, are decentralising their huge establishments by dispersing them to the countryside. Thus, from the strategic point of view too, decentralisation is advantageous.

PRODUCTION BY THE PEOPLE

(6) With rapid increase in our population, pressure on the land has become so immense that agriculture alone cannot sustain the rural people. As it is, out of 24,91 lakh persons belonging to the agricultural class, hardly 7,10 lakhs are self-supporting. Therefore, 17,81 lakhs must be given a subsidiary occupation to remove, what Johnson described as the "gloomy calm of idle vacancy." Agriculture itself does not keep the Indian farmers busy throughout the year. They have to remain idle for about 3 months during the off season, when they are in Keynes terminology, "the involuntary employed." A true social State cannot ignore this recurring period of idleness. Relevant to this context, is the advice of Pope Leo XIII, that "among the purposes of a society should be to try to arrange for a continuous supply of work at all times and seasons."

(7) The installed capacity of rural industries, like handloom weaving, oil seeds crushing, food grains processing, among others, is not being fully utilised as they are unable to compete with organised industries. Patronising the products of such local industries, will enable them to produce their maximum, and convert their days of forced leisure into silver yielding spells of time.

CHAPTER TWENTY-TWO

LIVE AND LET LIVE

*The art of progress is to preserve order amid change,
and to preserve change amid order.*

—A.N. WHITEHEAD: PROGRESS AND REALITY

MOST of the goods made by small-scale and cottage industries are being manufactured by big factories. Owing to this over-lapping of production, the small units are going to the wall. Obviously, small-scale industries will only be able to flourish, if competition between the products of village industries and those of large-scale establishments, is properly controlled. The decision of the Government to reserve a certain field for *Khadi* and hand-loom industries with a view to eliminating competition between hand-loom and mill-made cloth, has in a great measure, galvanised the hand-loom industry into activity. The same policy of reserving the field of production for other cottage industries must be pursued, so as to enable them to function vigorously. Till a well thought out common production programme between the large-scale consumer industries and small industries, is worked out, it will be difficult for these small units to grow. In the new social scheme, the big industrial undertakings must make a sacrifice. They have enjoyed protection for long. Even now they are enjoying facilities like concessional railway freights etc. These concessions have enabled the industrial sector to flourish. But, at the same time, they have had a deleterious effect on the growth of village industries. The harm that these concessions have done to the small units is so great that Dr. Rajendra Prasad holds the view that "this process has not only to be stopped but in some cases at least has to be reversed." The President further says: "We must act courageously and draw up a list of those fields which have to be reserved for village industries, and in which these industries have not to contend against, either indigenous mill-made goods, or foreign imports. This is the economics of village industries. This alone will suit our country, whatever may be the requirements of other countries."

II

DEMARCATIION of spheres of production, between large-scale and small-scale industries, should not be interpreted as the first step

to close the industrial sector in time to come. The fear is absolutely misplaced. Indeed, co-existence of big factories and small industries is of the very essence of Indian socialism. Big consumer industries have played a notable part in our economy in increasing wealth to fight poverty. Yet, their organised efficiency and competitive capacity, have struck a death blow to small industries, which were providing means of livelihood to millions. The adoption of the new socialist objective necessitates the maintenance of a judicious and harmonious balance between big and small industries, so that wealth instead of accumulating in the mansions of millionaires, is equitably distributed among the huts of numerous artisans. This judicious balance, which is the prerequisite of an integrated planned economy, can only be secured if the production of factory consumer goods is frozen at, or around the current levels, and further expansion of such industries is stopped. Of course, some increase in production for export purposes shall have to be allowed. But, so far as additional domestic consumption is concerned, it must be met by small industries. If that is done, the two sectors producing consumer goods, will be able to co-exist, and as a result of that the prevailing element of economic insecurity and destructive competition, will be eliminated. Balanced production alone can spread purchasing power more evenly, and bring about proper harmony between increasing production and effective demand.

While the big industrialists raise their hands in holy horror against the "inroads" into their sphere of production, it is a pity that they have not explored the possibility of small industries serving as ancillary units to large-scale industries. On this subject, the AICC, as far back as 1947, had expressed the view that "measures should be taken to co-ordinate the various types of industries, and thus link them up in a supplementary-complementary relationship. Large-scale industry should make the fullest use of cottage industries for processes which can be handled on handicraft, without serious loss of efficiency."

Small industries, in many advanced countries, act as feeder industries to big centralized units. The high importance of small industries, to supplement the mother concerns, has been realised by our industrialists. This is evident from the fact that in a reply to the Fiscal Commission's *questionnaire*, a few years back, many State Chambers of Commerce, had stated that in case of some industries, "large-scale industries could get some of their products produced by cottage and small industries." In this connection, it may also be mentioned that Sir George Schuster, a former Finance Member of the Viceroy's Council, who had been invited in 1953 by the Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, had suggested that this body should "interest itself in efforts to encourage the growth of such small industries, as would

supply components to large factories.”

It is high time that the big producers shed their contempt for small industries and encouraged their growth by making them function as useful complementary agencies of production. In this manner, the economic basis and the operative efficiency of a good number of small industries will improve, and the industrial base, instead of remaining narrow, will expand over wider areas. The more we broaden our industrial base, the stronger will be the foundation of our new socialised economy. A socialist State can afford to centralize its means of production, but a socialist society, which we are trying to establish, must spread out its units of production on the largest possible scale. “Then alone, the masses will feel,” says, the Railway Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, “the sensation of self-help in their economic life, and work as partners in the high adventure of rebuilding the present social system on a just and equitable basis.”

III

COMMON production programme will certainly help small-scale industries; yet they must be developed on scientific lines. Unless that is done, the ultimate objective of making these small units an economic proposition—and not just sponsoring them as a social welfare measure—will never be attained. The adoption of progressively improved technique is all the more essential, because cottage industries have been allotted a permanent place in the new socialistic economy, and their revival claims the magnitude of State Policy. Emphasizing the urgency of modernizing the present primitive production methods of village industries, the Prime Minister declares: “Machines have to go to the cottages and electric power to the huts.” All this will ensure the economic viability of cottage industries, and they will be able to pull their weight and not be a drag.

While we have decided to discard the old and out-moded forms of production, and modernize the manufacturing techniques, we should not go to the extreme length of developing a blind craze for modernization. Technology must be applied in a rational way. The warning of the distinguished philosopher, Thoreau, that men have become the tools of their tools, should be properly heeded. A technological improvement may admirably suit a Western country. Still, it may not be of much use in India. “Modern techniques which are labour intensive, simple and also inexpensive,” Mr. Gulzarilal Nanda, Minister for Planning, tells us, “would best suit our cottage industries.” Broadly speaking, the technology of developed countries has to be adapted to the peculiar

LIVE AND LET LIVE

needs of under-developed countries, in order to ensure maximum social and economic benefits. Needless to say, any attempt to transfer the technology of a highly developed country, to one that is essentially backward, without considering its special requirements and particular conditions, may do more harm than good. Discussing this important question, the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan says: "Unregulated or haphazard application of modern techniques, in all spheres of production, is apt to create, or aggravate, technological unemployment. There is need for regulation here."

The same judicious approach should be made in utilizing electricity for industrial purposes. If power is applied to replace persons already employed, then its use is bound to create a new social problem. The real social purpose of electric power should be to supplement the hands already working, and save men from the drudgery and physical dangers that certain mechanical operations involve. Moreover, electric power should be rationally distributed among big and small industries. If big industries receive the lion's share, the fate of small industries will become much worse, because with a still cheaper cost of production, due to the use of electric power, big industries will be in a more formidable position to compete with small industries.

IV

TECHNICAL improvements, however useful, will not yield the desired results unless men handling them are acquainted with the technical "know-how." For that purpose, training centres should be opened in every district to start with, and later on, in every tehsil. These centres will also attract young men, who do not wish to pursue higher studies and want to learn some productive craft. To-day, they just keep on studying, because near their homes they have no production centres to go to. Indeed, the problem of creating a countrywide net-work of training centres, is far more important than the question of improving orthodox techniques of production. It is through these training centres alone, that scientific research will be able to rejuvenate our decadent village industries. Science to the common man in India has largely smacked of secretiveness, although in the words of Viscount Samuel, "it is the master key which unlocks for mankind the store houses of knowledge." If industrial arts, which are the carriers and embodiments of scientific research, are taken to the countryside, not only will the economic condition of the masses be improved, but a dynamic change will also be brought in their social outlook. In the old capitalist society, science has been the monopoly of

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

millionaires. But, in the new socialistic order, which derives its strength from the enlightened masses, the fruits of scientific research must become the property of the millions. The value of scientific knowledge can be judged from the assertion of Prof. J.B.S. Haldane that science is vastly more stimulating to the imagination than are the classics.

CHAPTER TWENTY-THREE

LAND FOR THE LANDLESS

*Give fools their gold, and knaves their power ;
Let fortune's bubbles rise and fall ;
Who sows a field, or trains a flower,
Or plants a tree, is more than all.*

—J.G. WHITTIER: A SONG OF HARVEST

SOcialism in India will have no meaning at all, unless the life of the primary producer is made economically better and socially secure. Since 70 per cent. of India's 360 million population lives in villages, the nation's weal or woe, substantially depends on the prosperity, or adversity of our farmers. Tillage being the main source of livelihood, it is of paramount importance that the agricultural base should be strong. If we look at the economic pattern of advanced nations, we find that however much industrialised they may be, their prosperity rests on a well-organised agricultural base. Indeed, the profession of agriculture, even in a country like America which is the symbol of industrialisation, is held in high esteem. Discussing the social significance of agriculture, Daniel Webster, the noted American statesman, once said: "Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labour of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of our civilization." It is an historical truth that the over-all economy of a country can never be stable, unless the rural sector is properly looked after. England, for instance, almost faced famine after the German blockade in the last war, as it did not attach much importance to agriculture, but concentrated more on industries.

Some persons hold that emphasis on rural development will reverse the clock of social progress inasmuch as agriculture represents a primitive phase of human evolution. Consequently, they advocate an all-out programme of industrialisation to modernize Indian economy. No one denies the importance of industry to the raising of living standards of the people. But, the burden of our civilization, Prof. T.H. Tawney, strongly argues in his book, *The Acquisitive Society*, "is that industry has come to hold a position of exclusive predominance among human interests which no single interest, and least of all, the provision of the material means of existence, is fit to occupy." Agriculture supplies the basic needs of human beings ; without it life itself would perish. That is why

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

the celebrated satirist, Jonathan Swift asserted: "Whoever could make two ears of corn, or two blades of grass, to grow upon a spot of ground where only one grew before, would deserve better of mankind, and do more essential service to his country, than the whole race of politicians put together."

The slogan of "going back to the village" is not a retrograde step. On the other hand, India's philosopher Vice-President, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan says: "It is the only way to keep up a mode of existence that is instinctive to India, and that India should maintain her agricultural pattern of society, if we are not to lose contact with nature, and become completely automatised." This advice should be fully respected, for there is no country in the whole world, where rural economy is so heavily dependent directly on agriculture as ours.

II

THE problem of agricultural development is not a simple one. The solution of the problem does not merely lie in extending irrigation works, or building huge multipurpose projects. Of course, they have a social importance of their own and are essential to gear up production. But, the fundamental issue in our rural economy is how to overhaul the out-dated land tenure system, because feudalism, in any shape or form, in a society committed to the philosophy of egalitarianism, is a monstrous absurdity. The land problem is vast and intricate. Nevertheless, its very complexity constitutes a challenge to our determination to establish a socialistic society. The success or failure in finding the right solution will make all the difference between growing prosperity and continuing poverty in the land. The Planning Commission gives high position to the land question, for it says: "The future of land ownership and cultivation constitutes perhaps the most fundamental issue in national development. To a large extent, the pattern of economic and social organisation will depend on the manner in which the land problem is resolved. Sooner or later, the principles and objectives of the policy for the land, cannot but influence policies in other sectors as well."

It is a truism that except when the peasant feels mentally secure in his rights, and is assured of an equitable share in the fruits of his labour, his heart will not be in the work, even if the hand will steer the plough. And, nothing of worth or weight, Isaac Barrow, more than three centuries ago had told us, "can be achieved with half a mind, with a faint heart, and with a lame endeavour." Tons of water in the fields will never yield the expected results, so long as drops of sweat do not mingle with the

flowing water. For centuries, the peasant has slaved for the benefit of the absentee landlord. The burden of ages hangs heavily on his lean shoulders. To-day he is in no mood to sweat unless security of tenure is guaranteed to him. Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee, rightly observes in his book, *Land Reforms in India*, that "the standard of living of the Indian peasant cannot rise until a change in the land system supplies the essential economic basis of more efficient peasant farming." In truth, no scheme for economic rehabilitation of the country can fulfil its social purpose, if it does not aim at overhauling the static rural sector.

Realising the organic relationship between land reforms and sound agrarian economy, the Planning Commission has strongly recommended that social justice should be provided to the real tiller of the soil by securing him the permanent rights in land and a fair reward for his labour. This fair reward to the peasant is the prerequisite of human justice, and any attempt to deprive him of his rightful share of earning, is nothing but an act of hideous cruelty. Why ? The answer is given by Emerson. The distinguished essayist, in *Conduct of Life*, says : "The farmer is covetous of his dollar, and with reason. He knows how many strokes of labour it represents. His bones ache with the day's work that earned it." Some measure of social justice has been provided to the peasant by the abolition of the anachronistic system of Zamindari and other intermediaries, between the State and the actual tiller. But abolition of Zamindaris and Jagirdaris will by no means solve the land problem. Far-reaching steps have yet to be taken to give the farmer social status and economic security, that he so rightfully deserves. With the adoption of the new socialistic ideal, the urgency to bring about radical and fundamental changes in the land tenure system has increased manifold. The introduction of land reforms would help in building a socialist edifice on firm agrarian foundations.

III

INDIA is not the only country which is faced with the mighty problem of transforming the pattern of land tenure on a just and rational basis ; other nations also had to tackle the question of solving their land problems. The Green Revolution has taken place, in one form or the other, in every advanced country. Agrarian problems, by and large, are the same the world over, because the psychology, needs and aspirations of the men behind the plough are universal in character. Of course, the content of aspirations has always depended on the extent of social awakening. In fact, the land tenure system of every country, since times im-

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

memorial has been a counter-part of its socio-political structure. To start with, the agrarian economy was typically feudal, as landed aristocracy alone, held the reins of the Government. Peasants and farm workers were kept in economic servitude and pressed below the bottom rung of the social ladder. Strangled, as they were, the question of their voice being heard in the governance of the country never arose.

But, as social awareness developed, the peasantry became conscious of the crushing burden of serfdom and expressed its desire, in an unorganised way of course, for having the security of tenure. In some countries, the landlords reading the signs of Time, satisfied the new-born aspirations of the peasantry by introducing elementary land reforms. While in other countries, the feudal chiefs clung to their rights and tried to suppress the rising passions of agricultural labourers. A close study of world's agrarian history clearly shows, that countries which progressively introduced land reforms, commensurate with the longings of the peasantry, emerged socially cohesive, economically strong and politically well-knit nations. And countries which allowed the pent-up tensions of the farmer's heart to mount up, without relieving them by adjusting the rigid land tenure system, or softening its irksome rigours, suffered terribly in consequence. When suppressed social tensions, under the stimulus of desire for justice exploded, the entire peasantry rose in revolt and forcibly expropriated land from the unwilling aristocracy. Not only were the reforms sudden and radical, but much suffering was also caused, both to the landlords and the tenants. Indeed, violent upheavals rocked social equanimity, and due to the obstinacy of a limited number of landlords, the country as a whole suffered.

IV

THESE terrible experiences of other countries should serve as a lesson to us, and no time should be lost in satisfying the land hunger of the agricultural population. The urge to own a small farm being natural, its satisfaction becomes the foremost duty of a social State. That explains why the Congress, at its Avadi Session, called upon the Government to speed up its programme of agrarian reforms. These reforms will not only extend the base of social justice in the countryside, but in a great measure will revitalise the entire economy of India. Village being the heart of our economic organism, even a slight improvement in the rural sector will release vast forces of social progress, affecting the prosperity of the whole nation.

The land area being limited and a good portion of it being

LAND FOR THE LANDLESS

in possession of big landlords, how is the land hunger of the people to be satisfied ? The only way out of this predicament is to fix a ceiling on an individual holding and redistribute the rest of the land among agricultural labourers. In this respect, the Planning Commission has laid down that

- (1) There should be a limit to future acquisition of land ;
- (2) There should be an absolute limit to the land which an individual may hold ; this limit should be fixed by each State having regard to its agrarian history and its present problems, and only after taking a census of land holdings.

It is rather unfortunate that this recommendation, so essential not only for rehabilitating the unemployed agricultural labourers, but also for fulfilling our social objectives, has not been fully implemented by all the State Governments. Credit certainly goes to the few States which have placed a ceiling on existing holdings ; others have remained content by prescribing limits for future acquisition of land. But merely fixing a ceiling on future acquisition, or resumption, is not enough when the existing huge farms are not touched. "What justification is there for the existence of farms running into hundreds of acres, when 4.5 million landless labourers, clamour for a small piece of land to cultivate and eke out their livelihood ?" asks Prof. Shriman Narayan.

Perhaps, progress in the direction of fixing ceilings has been slow because of the feeling that by scrapping the feudalistic system of Zamindari and other intermediaries, the biggest hurdle in solving the land problem has been crossed. The step is certainly revolutionary, as this archaic system keeps the vast rural sector in a state of social backwardness. Even the Floud Commission, appointed in 1938, to report on the working of the Zamindari system, described landlordism "as an incubus on the existing agricultural society which finds no justification in the performance of any material service." Since the institution of intermediaries created all manner of hindrances in the social progress of the country, along with the freedom movement there was also a struggle for its elimination. In his monumental work, *Glimpses of World History*, Nehru rejected the system and wrote: "What has he (the zamindar) done to get this share or deserve it ? Nothing at all, or practically nothing. He just takes a big share in the produce—the rent—without helping in any way the work of production. He thus becomes a fifth wheel in the coach—not only unnecessary but an encumbrance and a burden on the land."

V

AS most of the State Governments have not shown the requisite enthusiasm to introduce this basic agrarian reform, it has been suggested that the Centre should take the initiative, and fix a ceiling on land holdings for the whole of India. Apparently, this proposition sounds plausible. Yet, in reality it is both impracticable and unwise. The land question differs from State to State, and the size of an economic holding also varies from one region to the other. This variation is due to the quality of soil and irrigation facilities. Further, the question of the availability of land and the density of population is an important one. Naturally, the ceiling in a thickly populated area cannot be the same as the ceiling in a sparsely inhabited area. Considering all these factors, the Planning Commission in its Final Report, published in 1952, suggested that a census of land holdings should be completed in 1953. In view of the fact that for full two years not much progress had been made in this direction, the All-India Congress Committee, at its Ajmer Session in July 1954, expressed regret at the delay in carrying out this census, and hoped that "every effort would be made to expedite this process." Thereupon, the Union Ministry of Agriculture urged upon the State Governments to speed up the work of having proper agricultural statistics compiled. It proposed that:

1. The census should relate to agricultural lands comprised in owner's holdings ;
2. It should be carried out by the revenue agency in each State as a special operation ; and
3. The responsibility for carrying out the census will rest with the State Governments.

The Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan informs us that "this census has now been carried out in most States. For 19 States the results of the census have become available ; reports from other States are shortly expected." It need not be emphasized that unless the requisite facts and figures are collected, suitable land legislation cannot be undertaken.

The States should also bear in mind that the Bhoodan movement has created a very favourable atmosphere for introducing land reforms through legislation. Indeed, the people have started thinking that instead of fixing the ceiling first and then distributing the remaining land, a piece of 5 acres should be given to a landless family first, and if there is any surplus land left after such distribution, a ceiling may be fixed on that. This is, truly, a revolutionary departure from the traditional way of fixing the ceiling first and distributing land afterwards. This radical way of solving India's knotty land problem originates from "the belief

that after the fixation of ceiling, not enough land might be left for redistribution among agricultural labourers." The veracity of this presumption will only be known when the land census is complete. Be that as it may, the social urgency of giving land to the landless for cultivation remains unquestioned. This issue is spotlighted by Henry George, when in his *Progress and Poverty*, he writes: "As labour cannot produce without the use of land, the denial of the equal right to use of land is necessarily the denial of the right of labour to its own produce."

VI

IN SPITE of the fact that the country's pattern of thinking, in respect of the question of land distribution, has become radically socialistic, the Zamindars are holding up their hands in holy horror, and swearing that "as a result of the fixation of ceiling, agriculture would become the monopoly of illiterate and backward classes, which would no longer produce men of leadership." By raising such fears, the Zamindars, who have lost their Zamindari privileges, are now trying to retain their rights to possess an unlimited area of land to be cultivated by hired labourers, so that they may extract a major share of the wealth produced. The ghost of Caesar stalked the land long after Caesar had been killed. Similarly, in our country, which is planning for a new egalitarian order, the ghost of landlordism still seems to stalk the land.

Our "natural leaders," so the landlords think themselves to be, should not forget that the Congress policy of land reforms is rather liberal. They will get "just and reasonable" compensation, and the ceiling limit is not going to be too low either. It is likely to be three times the size of an economic holding. Moreover, in order to save the joint family system from breaking up, ceiling for lands possessed by such families, may be fixed three times higher than those for individual families, as recommended by the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan. Again, a family holding has been defined by a committee of the Land Reform Panel "as the area of land which yields a gross income of Rs. 1,600 per annum, or a net annual income (including remuneration for family labour) of Rs. 1,200 and is not less than a plough unit."

Having pledged itself to establish a socialistic pattern, the Government is determined to eliminate dangerous economic disparities, that at present exist in India. So, the landlords should co-operate with the Government in reconstructing the social system on an equalitarian basis, instead of raising any hue and cry. If they have any doubt about the real intentions of the Government, let them remember the words of the Prime Minister: "I am

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

quite positive in my mind that there should be a ceiling on land, and the sooner it is brought about the better."

It is argued that the imposition of ceilings on land holdings in the agricultural sector only, without putting a limit on other incomes, would create social anomalies. This criticism is not wholly misplaced. Yet, we must not forget that the land was not created by man. It is Nature's own gift, and can neither be increased, nor decreased. And being the biggest property that India possesses, the process of removing economic inequalities must naturally start with land. It is obvious that unless land laws are changed radically, a poised occupational pattern in the rural sector cannot be created, and if the countryside continues to suffer from any imbalance, the whole economy will lack cohesion. In this connection, it is well to ponder over the assertion of Jefferson: "Whenever there is, in any country, uncultivated land and unemployed poor, it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended, as to violate natural right."

The critics should rest assured that disparities are not going to be left untouched in other spheres of property and wealth; in fact, far-reaching steps in that direction are being taken. The Estate Duty Act was the first such step. Then came the new Company Law. The declaration to establish a socialistic pattern of society will have no meaning, if income differentials in one sector are removed, and allowed to persist in other sectors. "Economic revolution," the Home Minister, Mr. G.B. Pant, maintains, "cannot be confined to land alone; it must touch all sectors of our national economy." As a matter of fact, the Congress since long, has been thinking in terms of narrowing the income differential in all social spheres. This is quite clear from the 1949 report of the Agrarian Reforms Committee. While recommending ceiling on land holdings, it had expressed the hope "that a similar principle of distributive justice would be applied to other sectors of our economy."

CHAPTER TWENTY-FOUR

COLLECTIVIZATION FACES CRISIS

No man but feels more of a man in the world, if he has a bit of ground, that he can call his own. However small it is on the surface, it is four thousand miles deep; and that is a very handsome property.

—C. D. WARNER : MY SUMMER IN A GARDEN

RADICAL land distribution is the foundation of a socialised economy. Still, some "agricultural experts" raise their hands in despair and give the warning, that this radical measure of agrarian reform would lead to an appreciable fall in food production. These theoreticians tell us that large-scale mechanised farming has done wonders in America and Soviet Russia. India, therefore, should not break up the large holdings for distributing land to the landless. On the other hand, they assert, that small holdings which already exist should be pooled together, and brought under giant tractor cultivation.

It is agreed that an individual land holding should not be so small as to make its cultivation uneconomic. For that very reason, the State Governments all over India have been going ahead with the programme of consolidation with a view to making individual holdings economically viable. All the same, it should not be taken for granted that a small holding is necessarily a losing asset. For instance, in Japan the average size of land ownership is about 2 acres. This is less than the average land holding in India, which ranges from 4.5 to 10 acres in different States. In spite of this very small size of holding, food production per acre in Japan is nearly three times higher than in India. This proves that the quantum of production does not entirely depend on the size of the holding, but largely on the methods of cultivation. In other words, better production results from the quality of seeds, fertility value of the manure, irrigation facilities and scientific methods of crop rotation.

II

NOW let us examine the productive potential of large-scale mechanized farming. The outstanding examples of large-scale farming are America and Russia. Of course, the social policy behind such farms in the two countries is basically different. Still,

the physical factor is common *i.e.*, the proportion of land to the farmer is very high. Labour being scarce and land abundant, these countries had no other alternative but to organise large-scale farming on a mechanised basis. In United States, for instance, only 18 per cent. of its population is engaged in agricultural profession. Even there we are told that "a tendency is growing towards smaller farming because a large number of people now desire to settle on land and live in 'garden cities' in the country." In India the ratio of population to land being high, the question of mechanised farming to save labour hardly arises.

The presumption that large-scale farming is far more efficient than small-scale farming is not wholly correct. A small land holding will not yield good production if the tiller is only a hired labourer, and primitive methods of cultivation are employed. But, if he is the owner of the holding and uses scientific methods, the production is quite high. In large-scale mechanised farming, productivity per labourer, undoubtedly increases, yet productivity per acre does not necessarily increase. Discussing this subject, Mr. Massingham, in his book, *The Small Farmer*, says: "Taking into account human limitations and other natural factors, wealth per acre (both 'input' and 'output') tends to move in inverse rates to the size of holding due to a persistent and permanent desire for a life of independence on the land."

It is argued that this theory may hold good in the case of America, as large-scale farming is organised on a capitalistic basis and the benefits of production go to the big owner. It is further stated that such a viewpoint cannot prevail in communist countries, where land being State-owned, the benefits of production go to society as a whole. The protagonists of large-scale farming should know that the experiment of collective farming in totalitarian countries has not been a very happy one. The process of collectivising agriculture caused great hardships to the peasantry. And, so far as agricultural production is concerned, the increase in the output, to start with, was not of a very high order. As a matter of fact, collectivization in Russia for the first two years brought near famine conditions. The Webbs, in their classic work, *Soviet Communism: A New Civilization*, give a lurid picture of the sufferings that the farmers had to undergo because of the large-scale shifting from their ancestral homes. Then, even after the stabilisation of collective farms, production has not reached the expected heights. This fact has been admitted by Soviet leaders. Recently, Mr. Vladimir Matskevitch, Soviet First Deputy Minister of Agriculture, stated that "some of our collective farms are lousy." Faced with the problem of stepping up agricultural production, Russia has been forced to give to persons working on big farms a piece of land to grow food for their personal needs. This was done to

satisfy the sense of belonging among the agriculturists, because communism, or no communism, the desire to possess is inborn in the peasantry. The great national value of the ownership of even a tiny piece of land is highlighted, when Henry George, in *Social Problems*, asks: "How can a man be said to have a country when he has no right to a square inch of it?"

In Eastern European communist countries, like Hungary, Yugoslavia and Poland, the policy of collectivization antagonized the peasantry, and because of that bitterness, agricultural labourers did not fully co-operate with the State in running the newly created collective farms. That is why the policy of collective farming had to be "slowed down." "Yugoslavia," Dr. Wahlen informs us, "has started land reform programmes, dissolving farm collectives into individual holdings, supplemented with various voluntary co-operative land uses and enterprises." In China also, collectivization is not compulsory. In fact, the peasant is allowed to function as an independent economic unit on the land which has been distributed to him. The Chinese agrarian reform aiming at the "protection of a system of private ownership by the peasants, as well as the development of mutual aid and co-operation," was adopted because of the grim and unfortunate experience of other Marxian countries.

III

INDIVIDUAL ownership satisfies the natural instinct of a farmer to have his own land, however small the piece may be. This satisfaction makes him interested in social stability. On that account Jefferson had laid down that "the small landholders are the most precious part of a State." Equitable distribution of land is a first class socialistic measure, but the duty of a social State does not end with distribution. The State has to provide facilities to the small farmer and guard against fall in production. If that is not done, the social purpose of land distribution cannot be fulfilled in entirety.

While the State should help the small landowners, they themselves must pool their resources of production, like cattle and irrigation and manuring, and also help each other at the time of sowing, weeding and harvesting, on a co-operative basis. Co-operative farming is the golden mean between the economic handicaps of small farming, and the authoritarian social rigours of collectivization. The Planning Commission recognising that attaches great importance to co-operative management as a means "to ensuring that land and other village resources are organised and developed from the standpoint of the village communities as a whole." Through co-operative farming, the two-fold objective of social

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

justice and proper use of small holdings, can be adequately achieved. But, unfortunately, little progress has been made in this direction. The Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan admits that "insufficient attention has been given so far to the programme for co-operative farming." So far only about 300 co-operative farming societies have been formed in India, with a total membership of about 9,500, covering an area of less than 70,000 acres. The Planning Commission has naturally been disappointed with this progress and has strongly urged upon the State Governments to draw up a phased programme to promote co-operative farming. The State Governments are now taking steps to make co-operative farming an integral part of rural economy.

The task of persuading owners of small farms to pool their resources co-operatively is undoubtedly difficult. Nevertheless, if the landowners are approached correctly, and the social aims and economic benefits of co-operation explained to them convincingly, the response will certainly be unfailing. Farmers by instinct are conservative. Therefore, intensive propaganda in favour of co-operative farming is needed. They have to be told that co-operative farming is a vital adjunct of the new socialistic economy that India is planning to build for their prosperity. It has been given high importance as it ensures better production, and at the same time, respects the natural aspirations of a farmer to function as a self-reliant economic unit. India having opted for democracy, totalitarian collectivization is ruled out, for that means regimentation of social resources. The national aim is to create conditions for the development of social cohesion and not dull social uniformity. As Douglas Jerrold said, "it takes all sorts of people to make a world." It is only through the preservation of the individual that the social ideal of a "fuller and varied life" can be realised. India will never resort to regimentation in any sphere of life since that leads to the stifling of creative urges. Variety as the base of our social pattern has to be prized, because it "is the very spice of life that gives it all its flavour." And as far as the American model of large-scale farming is concerned, its acceptance will tantamount to the introduction of capitalism with all its acquisitive evils in the rural sector. Obviously, that should be unthinkable, when India has decided to refashion the social system on egalitarian lines.

It may also be mentioned here that the Congress, even in the days of the freedom struggle, attached great importance to the concept of co-operative farming. In its Election Manifesto of 1945, it had declared itself in favour of "a system of co-operative farming suited to Indian conditions." And, believing in the beneficent ideals of social democracy, it had made clear that necessary changes should be made with the good will and agreement of the peasantry itself.

CHAPTER TWENTY-FIVE

RURAL REJUVENATION

*Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates, and men decay;
Princes and Lords may flourish, or may fade—
A breath can make them, as a breath has made—
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
When once destroy'd can never be supplied.*

—OLIVER GOLDSMITH: DESERTED VILLAGE

AGRICULTURE for the millions of our country is not mere business. In reality, it is life itself. But, unfortunately, agriculture in spite of its high social importance, has remained for centuries one of the "depressed industries." The peasant has led a mere hand-to-mouth existence. For that very reason, rural prosperity has been given top priority in the nation's programme to establish a socialistic pattern of society. If the glow of social democracy is to enlighten the peasantry, poverty shall have to be removed from the rural areas. This poverty cannot be driven out, unless the farmer is freed from the burden of indebtedness, which by itself, as Mr. M.G. Lightwer, the German fabulist, has said, "is the worst poverty." And indebtedness cannot be eliminated, unless cheap credit facilities are provided for agricultural and allied purposes. The extension of credit facilities is, therefore, the mainstay of rural recreation. That is why at its Avadi Session, the Congress called upon the Government to take measures with a view to supplying credit facilities to agriculturists. In point of fact, the task of rescuing the peasantry from the shackles of indebtedness, has always been an article of faith with the Congress. In support of this contention, it may be stated that as far back as 1936, the Congress had declared that "the crushing burden of rural debt should be removed and steps should be taken to provide cheap credit facilities."

II

SO far most of the credit in the rural areas has been supplied by agricultural and commercial money-lenders, traders and commission agents. The terrible havoc caused to rural economy by these middle men, indeed, constitutes one of the blackest chap-

ters in India's social history. The grim consequences of private credit were aptly described by Mr. Wolfe when he wrote: "It is usury, practised by the money-lenders—the rankest, most extortionate, most merciless usury—which eats the marrow out of the bone of the ryot and condemns him to a life of penury and slavery, in which not only is economic production hopeless, but in which also energy and will become paralysed, and man sinks down beaten into a state of resigned fatalism from which hope is shut out and in which life drags on wearily and unprofitably, as though with no object in view." It should also not be forgotten that rural indebtedness has led to the passing of land from the real farmers to big landlords and resourceful middlemen. As a result of this transfer, former owners of land became wage earners. The Central Agricultural Labour Survey has estimated that out of a total of 58 million rural families, at least 30 per cent. have to depend mostly on labour in the fields of other men. Considering the dire social consequences of private credit, Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain, the Union Minister for Food and Agriculture, affirms that "any prolonged continuance of rural credit and marketing in the hands of private agencies is fraught with dangers."

The extent of rural indebtedness has been the subject of enquiry from time to time. In 1880, the Famine Commission after touring the entire country concluded, that "one-third of the land-holding classes were deeply and inextricably in debt." The amount was calculated to be nearly Rs. 300 crores. The Banking Enquiry Commission, in 1929, estimated the rural indebtedness to be in the neighbourhood of Rs. 900 crores. In 1933, Prof. P.J. Thomas held that "if the total agricultural debt of British India was about Rs. 900 crores in 1929, it must have increased to about Rs. 1200 crores by 1933." The Rural Credit Survey Committee, popularly known as the Gorwala Committee, appointed by the Reserve Bank, has now estimated the rural debt to be Rs. 750 crores. The figure has fallen because the agriculturists cleared some of their debts in the war time boom.

In order to give some relief to the distressed agriculturists, Provincial Governments in British days, took certain measures like the grant of *taccavi* loans under the Agriculturists Loans Act and the Land Improvements Act. After the worldwide slump of 1929 which hit the agriculturist adversely, laws limiting the rates of interest charged by money-lenders were passed. Legislation for debt conciliation and arbitration and for compulsory scaling down of the loan, was also enacted. Such measures for the settlement and reduction of agriculturists' debts, and for the regulation of money-lending, however beneficial in their own way, were the negative aspects of social policy, which to be effective, had to cover positive aspects as well, by providing institutional credit

RURAL REJUVENATION

to the farmer on cheap and easy terms. By legislative enactments, mortgage and alienation of land could be stopped, but "mortgage of the peasant, his family and farm products, to the money-lender could not be prevented." However, as a result of the usury control legislation, the professional money-lenders became shy of making advances. And due to the middle man's "go slow" policy, the credit reservoir of the rural sector appreciably contracted. The land reform legislation, too, has made the private rural credit a vanishing figure.

The co-operative credit movement was intended to supplement private credit, and thereby, moderate its worst excesses. The movement was also expected to fill in the gap created in the rural economy by the reluctance of money-lenders to advance loans. In fact, great hopes were placed on the co-operative movement for solving the problems of agriculture. So much so, that the Royal Commission on Indian Agriculture had stated: "If co-operation fails, there will fail the best hope of Indian agriculture." Without being uncharitable to the co-operative movement, it has to be said that co-operation has not come up to the country's expectations. That is why the Rural Credit Survey Committee has held that "the co-operative credit movement, as at present constituted, is ineffective in practice, and wholly unsuitable for the high objectives of agricultural planning." This conclusion is based on the fact that the co-operative credit movement has accounted for a mere 3.1 per cent. of the cultivator's borrowings.

The role played by commercial banks in providing credit facilities to the agricultural sector has been rather negligible. They hardly supply 1.9 per cent. of the total borrowings by the farmers. Of course, the commercial banks are playing a notable part in accelerating the industrial and commercial development of the country. These banks have not extended their activities to the countryside, as it is not considered a business proposition by them. Banks usually open branches where they are assured of a minimum amount of business. Not many villages can be spotted, where the minimum volume of business, can be made certain. And these banks, as Mr. B. Rama Rao, a Reserve Bank Governor, has said, "have to look after the interests of their shareholders."

Even if the commercial banks were induced to open branches in villages, the big question of the kind of security that the agriculturists would give shall have to be faced. Securities like land, cattle and house would not be accepted by a commercial bank. That would be harming the principle of liquidity, which is the basis of sound commercial banking. Moreover, most of the agriculturists have no assets against which they could get loans, except their personal bonds guaranteed by sureties. Needless to say,

such bonds are a taboo to commercial banking institutions. But the Agrarian Reforms Committee, appointed in 1949, rightly observed that "lack of credit-worthiness should not come in the way of the cultivator in securing the essential requirements of farming. This has been the biggest impediment in the progress of institutional credit. The percentage of uncredit-worthy cultivators in India is so vast that any scheme of credit which confined itself to the so-called credit-worthy cultivators will only touch the fringe of the problem, leaving the vast number to the mercy of money-lenders." The Committee recognised that the extension of credit to uncredit-worthy cultivators would ultimately amount to a scheme of subsidisation. Still, it felt that there was no escape from such commitments. Therefore, it recommended that all such finance should be considered as a part of a scheme for rehabilitation.

III

AFTER considering the expensive nature of private lending and the failure of the co-operative credit movement to provide credit facilities, and the insignificant contribution of commercial banks as financiers to the rural sector, the Rural Credit Survey Committee suggested a way to solve the problem of rural credit. The Committee expressed the view that the entire rural credit structure should be institutionalised and its basis should be the co-operative principle. Summing up the role of co-operation it said: "Co-operation has failed but co-operation must succeed." The principle of co-operation was accepted, as the Government just could not be expected to grant loans directly to lakhs of needy farmers through its administrative machinery. Further, credit should be provided in a manner which is in conformity with the principles of sound banking. Then alone the institution of credit could be built on a positive democratic base.

Keeping all these things in view, the Rural Credit Survey Committee recommended the setting up of "one strong integrated State-partnered commercial banking institution with an effective machinery of branches spread over the whole country for co-operative and other banks, and following a policy which would be in effective consonance with the national policies accepted by Government without departing from the canons of sound business." In simple language, the State Bank was to promote extensive and inexpensive credit facilities, mostly through the medium of co-operative agencies, and mainly for the needs of agriculture and small industries. Thus, for the first time, a bold and stout-hearted attempt has been made to find a solution for the baffling

RURAL REJUVENATION

problem of agricultural finance. The proposal for setting up the State Bank is part of an integrated scheme of rural development of which the other components are the development of co-operative rural credit, the organisation and extension of storage and warehousing, as well as processing and marketing and a programme for the training of suitable personnel. State participation, involving financial assistance, is envisaged in all these fields. All this proves, as Mr. Gulzari Lal Nanda, Minister for Planning, has said, "the keenness of the Government to translate socialistic aspirations into socialistic action."

It may be mentioned that the scheme of management of the new State Bank is on lines almost similar to the proposals made by the Agricultural Finance Sub-Committee in its report of 1946. The Committee had recommended the setting up of "Provincial Credit Corporations as alternative agencies of credit in different provinces," to function as "autonomous public corporations established by the State and operating under general official supervision and direction, but whose day-to-day working and normal business transactions are largely conducted on independent basis."

IV

IN pursuance of this recommendation, the Government of India, on December 20, 1954, announced its decision to "assume effective control over the Imperial Bank." The decision to nationalise the Imperial Bank was not abrupt. The question had cropped up earlier as well, and Mr. C.D. Deshmukh, the Union Finance Minister, tells us that, "if in March 1950, the radical change was not affected that was because the country's monetary structure was in a very unsettled condition." The Imperial Bank, it may be recalled, came into existence on January 27, 1921, by taking over the undertakings of the Bank of Bengal, the Bank of Bombay and the Bank of Madras.

The main object in nationalising this foremost banking institution has been to vitalise rural life and rejuvenate rural areas. Agrarian reforms, on which the Government has put the highest priority in extending the base of social justice in the vast countryside, could not be effectively implemented, unless credit facilities were provided to the peasantry on easy and cheap terms. That being so, the establishment of the State Bank constitutes a measure of fundamental reform for the static agricultural sector. Through this new banking institution, the farmer will be liberated from the tight clutches of the money-lender, and helped to gain his social status. The degradation that private credit brings about is best described by Victor Hugo. In *Les*

Miserables, the distinguished novelist, says: "A creditor is worse than a master; for a master owns only your person, a creditor owns your dignity, and can belabour that."

The State Bank will open 400 new branches in the rural areas within five years, which would work in close collaboration with co-operative banks and warehousing societies. The Imperial Bank has already 472 branches. The State Bank branches would not only cater to agricultural credit, but would also meet the needs of village industries. Thus, the Imperial Bank, reborn in a new shape, would serve the real interests of socialist India. As part of the scheme, certain State-associated banks *i.e.*, banks which have been functioning on the basis of special relations with Governments in the areas of Part "B" States, are also to be amalgamated with the State Bank in due course. There are ten such State-associated banks, and if all of them are brought in, they will add 313 more offices to the net-work of the State Bank.

V

IT is stressed by critics that since the Imperial Bank had all along been functioning as the premier commercial credit institution, and its staff has only been trained in the procedure and practices of commercial banking, it would not be in a position to discharge its new duties of catering to the needs of the agricultural sector. In support of this contention is cited the opinion of the Indian Central Banking Enquiry Committee that "mixed banking should not be pursued by the Indian joint stock banks." This criticism is somewhat justified. Yet, what is the alternative? Surely, the Reserve Bank cannot be expected to build a nationwide framework of credit agencies in the rural areas. Such a proposition would have been fantastic, both on administrative and financial grounds. And, so far as the commercial banks are concerned, they have not shown any inclination to extend credit facilities to the needy farmer. The only alternative was to take over the Imperial Bank, and to open new branches in the rural areas. Of course, the staff in charge of these new branches shall have to learn new methods and procedure of rural credit, as the credit period for which loans are advanced, the nature of security, the object for which loans are given, and the period for which deposits are accepted, vary from the usual commercial credit practices.

Let there be no room for doubt that nationalisation of the Imperial Bank will in any way be prejudicial to the private sector. The State Bank will still be making credit facilities available to

RURAL REJUVENATION

trade and commerce. Nationalisation of the Imperial Bank should not be considered as the first step towards nationalisation of other banking institutions. The Prime Minister has categorically stated that "at present the Government has no intention to encroach on private commercial banks."

CHAPTER TWENTY-SIX

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethern, ye have done it unto me.

—NEW TESTAMENT: MATTHEW

VOLUNTARY removal of social distinctions and economic inequalities, through moral persuasion, has been the dream of Utopian socialists since the days of Thomas More and Robert Owen. After more than four centuries of idealistic thinking, Vinobaji's one-man crusade against exploitation, is turning that dream into a reality. The social conscience of the rich is being aroused, and an atmosphere of sharing one's wealth with those who have been doomed to live a life of misery, is being created. The results so far achieved have been more than expected, and as "the god who gives away land" continues his march, more and more people come forward to fulfil their social obligation to the less privileged. Truly, Vinobaji's message of human brotherhood is, in a great measure, reducing the magnitude of social distress. "Half the misery of human life," Addison once said, "might be extinguished if men would alleviate the general curse they lie under by mutual offices of compassion, benevolence and humanity."

The Land Gifts Mission started by the 61 year old frail, lean scholar-saint, at an age when most people retire from the activities of life, is helping in the establishment of a crystal clear socialistic society. The pattern of such an ideal society is being created by Vinobaji, because through his Bhoodan he is supplying, as Mr. U.N. Dhebar has put it, "that moral and emotional aspect which will provide soul and spirit to the socio-economic activities of the nation."

II

BOTH by its constitution and social philosophy to which it subscribes, India is committed to transform the existing social order through peaceful co-operative methods. Any doubt about the dynamism of democratic ways is removed by a dispassionate study of the Bhoodan movement. A proper appreciation of the movement which is ushering in a new revolution in India will also strengthen,

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

one's faith in the goodness of human nature. The vitality of such a faith in the present context has become a social necessity, as true socialism can only be built on the basis of mutual trust, willing co-operation and voluntary self-sacrifice. In a society based on such human values, people will think more of their social duties and less of their individual rights. In a capitalist society, because of its acquisitive basis, moral much less spiritual values, have any say in determining social conduct. Sociologists have come to the conclusion that as a result of this digression from ethical standards, the evils of distrust, strife and greed prevail in the world. The Bhoodan movement, by initiating the process of moral persuasion, is integrating all aspects of human life on certain transcendent foundations.

Such being the noble significance of Bhoodan, its originator has been called "Gandhiji's direct spiritual successor." "His spiritual stature," Mr. Alvin R. Field says, "is so large that his shadow falls across this sub-continent." Gandhiji knew of the high qualities of his 25 year younger ashramite colleague. Many a time he would tell persons who wanted to understand his philosophy to visit Vinobaji's ashram, as Vinobaji understood his ideas better than he did. He once wrote to the parents of Vinobaji: "To reach his spiritual attainments, I have passed a life time of spiritual endeavour." In fact, Gandhiji quite often felt that he could not practise the same spontaneous detachment and philosophical asceticism that Vinobaji could in everyday affairs. The Master's faith in his disciple has been amply justified, for he has been acclaimed by the Western world as "The Walking Messiah."

III

GANDHIJI had placed before the nation his theory of trusteeship *i.e.*, the rich must hold their possession in trust for the have-nots. And to-day, this "saint and scholar and social bomb-thrower," by appealing to the finer sentiments of the people, is giving a practical shape to this Gandhian concept of private wealth. Indeed Vinobaji by educating the people into the time-honoured philosophy of "non-possession," is ushering in a new era of social equality and economic freedom, which Gandhiji owing to his premature death, could not achieve.

Vinobaji's life is simple to the extreme. He has given up everything that one has to give up. He has selflessness of the sages. His fame springs from his "personal holiness." It is difficult to find a parallel to this twentieth century saint from amongst his contemporaries. The reason is quite obvious. Vinobaji is neither a politician nor a statesman nor a scientist. "He

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

is essentially an ascetic—God's messenger on earth, an instrument for divine powers for the welfare of mankind," a Danish journal writes. Wherever this great mind with child-like simplicity goes, people welcome him with open arms, for he gives them new hopes, unfolds new visions. The mud huts of the people, whom society has treated as *pariahs*, wear a new look of festivity when he enters a village.

IV

THROUGHOUT his life, Vinobaji has been accustomed to lead a secluded life. But for the last four years, he has been walking about 15 miles every day, collecting land for the landless. Single-handed this "new star of India" is serving those unfortunate persons whom man in his lust for power and greed for wealth, had neglected in a shameless manner. By serving the poor he is serving his Creator, because for him God does not reside in historical shrines but in the mud huts of the low and the lowliest. The words of Walt Whitman that "in the faces of men and women, I see God," appropriately hold good in the case of Vinobaji. Addressing a meeting of Harijans, he once said: "For me the place where you all live is the sacred place. To me your bodies are not just compounds of five elements. I look upon you as my God. Long journeys tire out this frail body. But when I get an opportunity of serving you, my fatigue vanishes." To him all men are the same—children of the same Father. Therefore, he accepts gifts, big or small, from all. Sacrifice is not the prerogative of the rich; the poor too, have something to offer. That is why he says: "I am a stream in which rivers come with all types of water—dirty, hard, soft or fine. I accept them with good grace."

During the short span of four years, Vinobaji's novel method has attracted millions of men and women in India. In truth, his movement has aroused world interest, as his message is not confined to his own country. His object is to transform the whole society. Vinobaji's social philosophy finds expression in the following lines of John Wesley:

*Do all the good you can,
By all the means you can,
In all the ways you can,
In all the places you can,
At all the times you can,
To all the people you can,
As long as ever you can.*

CHAPTER TWENTY-SEVEN

REAL REVOLUTION

*Press bravely onward :—not in vain
Your generous trust in human kind ;
The good which bloodshed could not gain
Your peaceful zeal shall find.*

—J. G. WHITTIER : TO THE REFORMERS OF ENGLAND

SINCE the martyrdom of Gandhiji, his devoted band of village workers had been holding annual conferences to exchange notes and chalk out plans for carrying on the various items of constructive work. This they did, as Gandhiji loved constructive work more than anything else in life. In 1951, they decided to hold the conference at Hyderabad and requested Vinobaji to give them the lead because without his presence the conference would be “like a candle that does not burn.” At first, Vinobaji was not agreeable but when he was told that if he did not come the conference would be cancelled, he accepted the invitation. However, there was one condition attached to his participation in the conference—he would walk to Hyderabad, and that would take him more than a month to complete the journey. The organisers agreed to the wish of the man who was destined to make history in Hyderabad.

At that time, in the Telengana region of Hyderabad, the communists had let loose an orgy of violence and as a result of their disruptive activities, anarchy was prevailing. There was so much of death and destruction, that aristocracy had run away in fright to big towns for shelter. The poor having no place to go to, helplessly followed anyone who gave them any hope. Things were so bad that this region came to be known, as “the Yenan of India.” Aptly has a writer described the conditions there: “People were being ground down mercilessly between the two mill stones of State authority and communist activity. They knew no end of their plight. All belief in democracy, non-violence, peace or human brotherhood, was on the point of collapse.”

When Vinobaji entered the communist dominated area, where even armed police felt nervous to set its foot, he counselled people to “keep cool and not to get panicky.” As he toured the disturbed area, he realised that the communists had secured a stronghold because the landlords had kept the land to themselves. They had also exploited in a ruthless manner the sweated labour of the landless peasants. The gulf between the rich and the poor

was perhaps the widest in India. He approached the communists who had been exhorting the tenants to rise against the landlords, and said to them: "You are like doting mothers. You love the masses and want to ruin everyone else for their sake. But doting mothers end by ruining their children too."

II

IT was on April 18, 1951 that the idea of Bhoodan Yajna was born, for on this day the first land gift was made. How did that happen? In the small village of Pochampolle, forty Harijans went to Vinobaji and asked him for land. If only they could get some land, their miseries would end, they declared. Moved by the plight of these forty persons, that very evening at a prayer meeting, he appealed to the landlords and said: "If you had five sons and a sixth was born to you, you would give him a portion of your estate. Treat me as your sixth son and give me one-sixth for redistribution to the poor." On hearing these words, the biggest landlord of the village, Mr. V. Ramchandra Reddy, a law graduate from Bombay University, rose up and offered hundred acres of land. The forty Harijans conferred with each other as to how those hundred acres should be utilised. They felt that they could manage with two acres each and returned the remaining twenty to the donor. This "double act of generosity" made Vinobaji realise the social and economic significance of the hundred acre donation of land. Thus was born India's first class movement since independence—a movement which in the words of Prof. Shriman Narayan, "symbolises the urge and ideal of a non-violent and decentralised democracy of India and other nations of the world."

Vinobaji believes that Bhoodan has its birth from divine inspiration. Describing its origin he says: "Five years ago something happened at Pochampolle of which neither I nor anybody else had any pre-vision. I feel it is God's work. I am only an experiment in the hands of Him who is the Lord of all ages. It is the phenomenon inspired by God. For, how otherwise can people who fight even for a foot of land be inspired to give away freely hundreds of acres." Cynics might say that Vinobaji's belief in the supernatural birth of Bhoodan is nothing but a superstition. Such a viewpoint is hardly fair. Let us hear what Sir Arthur Conan Doyle has to say on the highly controversial subject of the existence and influences of supernatural forces. He tells us: "Several incidents in my life have convinced me of spiritual interposition of the promptings of some beneficent force outside ourselves, which tries to help us where it can." Being convinced that the Providence

REAL REVOLUTION

had chosen him to help solve the knotty problem of land distribution, Vinobaji has been spreading his message of human brotherhood through self-renunciation, as saints have done through all the ages.

III

IN the beginning, many people were sceptical about the success of the movement. So much so that some laughed at the very idea. At first they thought that Vinobaji would get some land as temples and other shrines usually get. They could scarcely believe that his simple ideas would develop into a popular mass movement; and that his plain thoughts would initiate a mighty social process for the regeneration of human values. But, the biggest events in this world have had the smallest beginning. That, indeed, is the law of evolution. In his poem, *Little Things*, Mr. J.F. Carney, sings of it:

*Little drops of water, little grains of sand,
Make the mighty ocean, and the pleasant land.
Little deeds of kindness, little words of love
Help to make earth happy, like the heaven above.*

To-day, those who jeered at the very postulates of the Land Gifts Mission, acknowledge with admiration the unprecedented success that this "giant non-violent reformer" has achieved. Slowly but surely, the Bhoodan movement has survived the three initial stages of ridicule, indifference and criticism. These are the usual phases through which every reformist movement has to pass before it gains social recognition. Depicting the tremendous social forces that Bhoodan has released, Miss Pat McMahon, an American, who joined Vinobaji in 1952, states: "It has been my luck to observe one of the most successful attempts in applied social psychology of the age. Leaving this movement will be like jumping off from a moving train."

IV

TO start with, the Bhoodan Yajna aimed at collecting land from those who had, and distributing it among those who did not have. But as the work progressed, it was realised that the objective of the movement could not be achieved, unless those who were given land were also provided with the means to cultivate it, such as water, bullocks, seeds and ploughs. Consequently, on October 23, 1952 Vinobaji declared: "The purpose behind the movement could not be fulfilled unless we went further and asked for a portion

of wealth and property. And hence, I made up my mind that I must also ask for a share of wealth and property from the people. I have now done it and placed my demand at one-sixth of it." This donation of one-sixth of wealth and property he called *Sampattidan Yajna* (Property Gifts Movement).

The idea evoked ready response and the Prime Minister welcoming it said: "Now Vinobaji has placed a new idea before the nation. He has talked of *Sampattidan* in order to rehabilitate and help the landless peasants. He has specially called for the construction of new wells. Our peasant will not be benefited much if he gets only land, and is given no other assistance. Wells are needed in the whole country. I hope and trust that everyone will ponder over Vinobaji's new message and specially help the construction of wells."

In the Bhoodan movement only persons owning land were asked to give one-sixth of their holding. But for *Sampattidan Yajna* persons who do not possess land are expected to donate one-sixth of their wealth or property. It must, however, be borne in mind that a man with surplus land must donate land, and not other wealth.

The principle behind the *Sampattidan* movement is the same as that behind Bhoodan *i.e.*, just as land cannot exclusively belong to any individual, similarly, wealth cannot be the sole monopoly of a single person. It has to be utilized for the benefit of society which, of course, includes the interest of the individual. The practical implication of this social concept of private ownership of property is that only after giving away the sixth part, the remaining should be used. The ethical aspect of sharing wealth is spotlighted by Victor Hugo, when he expresses his belief, that as the purse is emptied, the heart is filled.

The promise of *Sampattidan* is for the whole life; if for any reason that is not possible, it is at least for a period of five years. From the money thus collected, seeds and ploughs are supplied to those who have been given land. However, there is no fixed rule that the donation must be given in cash. If the person making the gift wants, he can spend the money himself on different socially useful items. But, he has to send the account to the Sarva Seva Sangh.

V

IN case a person has neither land, nor wealth to offer for the service of the poor, what should he do to help build up the new social order? For such people, Vinobaji has put forth the idea of *Shram Dan i. e.*, he can make his contribution in the form of

REAL REVOLUTION

labour. In this scheme, the poorest can participate in the nation-building activities. Self-sacrifice in every form is a social asset. Yet, if comparison were to be made between different forms of self-sacrifice, many would give higher status to voluntary labour than to the surrender of wealth. In his book, *The Prophet*, Kahlil Gibran, rightly observes: "You give little when you give of your possessions. It is when you give of yourself that you truly give." As a result of the social climate created by the doctrine of *Shram Dan*, numerous people are offering voluntary labour in constructing roads, school buildings, and levelling streets under the Community Projects scheme. Such participation by the masses has revolutionised the social values of erstwhile indifferent and diffident villagers. The abundant faith that Vinobaji has placed in the goodness of human nature is being justified, and the selfish man of the capitalist society, is being changed into a selfless man of the new socialist order.

Congress socialism demands sacrifice from every person, whatever be his status. The process through which the socialist pattern is to take shape being democratic, the voluntary co-operation of the people is most needed. From this angle, *Sampattidan* and *Shram Dan* have a vital role in establishing a truly egalitarian society.

CHAPTER TWENTY-EIGHT

ETHICAL VIEW OF ECONOMICS

The equal right of all men to the use of land is as clear as their equal right to breathe the air—it is a right proclaimed by the fact of their existence. For, we cannot suppose that some men have a right to be in this world, and others no right.

—HENRY GEORGE: PROGRESS AND POVERTY

UNTIL a few centuries ago, there was no such thing as private ownership of land in India. The land used to belong to the whole village. The economic life of a village was properly organised; some did the cultivation, and others worked as weavers, carpenters, potters etc. Agriculture and other professions were complementary to each other. The produce from land was shared on a community basis. This equitable sharing left no room for dissatisfaction. Then slowly new forces started working, and the socio-economic pattern of a corporate village life began disintegrating. And, out of this break-up of village homogeneity, came the institution of private ownership in land.

It stands to reason that village brotherhood can only be revived, if the concept of private property and wealth, undergoes a radical change. True social homogeneity, in an acquisitive society, can hardly be achieved. For that reason, Vinobaji declares: "Ownership of land is wrong. It is a free gift of nature. It is foolish to believe that it can belong to one class of people alone." Having enunciated the theory that land should not belong to any social class, he asserts that "just as everybody has free access to the use of water, air and sun, so should everyone have an equally free access to the use of land." In other words, just as a person who is thirsty has a right to ask for water, similarly, a person who wants to work as an agriculturist has a right to demand land. This right is based on the fundamental principle of social justice which lays down that the hungry must either be given food, or provided with work. But, advanced social thinking rejects charity as a measure of human respect. For instance, Roosevelt holds the view that "continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fibre. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic—a subtle destroyer of the human spirit."

ETHICAL VIEW OF ECONOMICS

Thus charity brings about more permanent social harm than the little immediate good that it may do to an individual. No wonder, Mr. R. Lynd, some years back, in *The New Statesman*, wrote: "A miscarriage of mercy is as much to be guarded against as a miscarriage of justice." True charity does not mean just feeding the hungry; but in removing the root causes of misery and equipping the sufferers to combat it themselves. That, indeed, is the correct approach to social justice. "And the mistake of the best men through generation after generation," Ruskin says, in *Unto This Last*, "has been that great one of thinking to help the poor by almsgiving, and by preaching of patience or of hope, and by every other means, emollient or consolatory, except the one thing which God orders for them, justice."

Emphasising the correctness of the right to work, Vinobaji maintains: "It may be a matter of shame to ask for food, but there is no shame in asking for land, because that shows readiness to work for one's living. Land does not yield its gifts unless one is ready to put in manual labour. In asking for land, one is merely asking for work which it is everybody's right to demand. Lokamanya Tilak said: 'Swaraj is our birthright,' even so do I declare that he who is ready to work on land can ask for land as his birth-right."

But is this right to demand land to work on born out of economic consideration alone, or has it any ethical basis as well? The primary motive is certainly economic. And it has to be so because, as pointed out by Mr. H.W. Van Loon in *The Story of Mankind*, "the history of the world is nothing but the record of a man in quest of his daily bread and butter." Nevertheless, in the final analysis, the desire to possess some land has a deep spiritual significance since Vinobaji regards "cultivation as a means of divine service." Jefferson, in his *Notes on Virginia*, also expressed a similar view when he said: "Those who labour in the earth are the chosen people of God, if He ever had a chosen people, whose breasts He has made His peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue." Land in the philosophy of Bhoodan is not a mere source of production but a medium to worship God. To attain spiritual heights, Vinobaji affirms: "It is more substantial to work on land than to perform penance for this purpose." The spiritual significance of working on the land is so deep to Vinobaji that if he were given the choice between denying Harijans the right to enter temples and not permitting them to work on the land, he would rather deny them the entry into temples than refuse them the right to work on the land. According to Vinobaji, the worship of God is best done through the service of land.

Such is the importance that Vinobaji attaches to the problem of giving land to the landless. That is why he feels that the

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

Land Gifts Mission would only achieve its objective when "those with land would go out anxiously in search of the tiller and gladly give him land as well as other necessities like seeds and implements to work with, even as they go out to-day in search of a groom for their daughter, and equip her with all household requisites when she leaves her old home for the new."

II

STARTING with the distribution of land received as a donation, within a short time, the movement has developed into a truly holy campaign to change persons by persuasion. This technique of transforming the values of the people is based on the fundamental Gandhian belief, that irrespective of outward differences, men are basically the same at heart. By appealing to the goodness in man, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan says, "Bhoodan aims at shaping the social order as the family writ large." The present social system suffers from the handicaps of disparities, distrust and individualism. But, Bhoodan is bringing about an atmosphere of equality, brotherhood and social co-operation by installing humane values. That being the social ideal of Bhoodan, Mr. U. N. Dhebar holds: "It aims at giving a direction to our social and economic programme and giving a new content and meaning to the social order we envisage."

The social potentialities of this humanitarian movement are so immense, that it can be safely described as a march further in the evolution of mankind. By eliminating all manner of exploitation through changing one's social outlook, Bhoodan is rearing up new human beings, and thus enlivening the pattern of a new world. The urgency in spreading the movement is, indeed very great, as at present the social framework does not rest on just foundations, and men do not behave as they should, by sharing their wealth with those who have none. The rich must realise that wealth is an entrusted property and not an inviolable interest of the few, because whatever they acquire is the result of social labour. Viewed from this social angle, wealth cannot be the exclusive property of an individual. Private ownership like an adopted son is a legal fiction. It is based on law and not on justice. Law and justice being two different things, in a true humanitarian social order, justice must prevail. Such being the ethical concept of property, the American poet, Mr. O.W. Holmes, for the guidance of the rich has laid down: "Put not your trust in money, but your money in trust."

III

IT is frequently asked: Why did Vinobaji choose land as the medium to emphasise the ethical view of economics? The answer is best provided by him. "Land is only a symbol. Land appeases the people's hunger. It creates self-confidence. It gives new trust. It underlines the thought that land like water and air belongs to everybody and is to be shared by all."

The real progress of a country can only be measured by the living standards of the poorest people. Their needs, therefore, should have first priority; otherwise the country, however prosperous at the top, will remain weak. The biggest property that India has to-day is land, and the largest number of people depend upon land for their living. Persons who have waited for centuries to be given some land, should be given land without any delay. If that is not done, socialism for the vast rural sector will have no meaning. Propaganda in favour of equitable distribution of land has been done by the earliest Utopian socialist thinkers. "Every man has by the law of nature," wrote Sir Thomas More over four centuries ago, in *Utopia II*, "a right to such a waste portion of the earth as is necessary for his subsistence."

IV

THE target that has been fixed for the collection of land donations is 5 crore acres by the end of 1957. This figure roughly represents one-sixth of the total cultivable land in India. The number of persons who have no land is also about 5 crores. Vinobaji wants each member of a family to get one acre, or a family of five, to receive five acres. That being his premises for land distribution, he asks every landowner to donate one-sixth of his land. It is presumed that if a family of five gets five acres that will be enough for its living. The average holding in different States ranges from 4.5 acres to 10 acres. But, there is enough land above the holdings of 30 acres. If the owners of these holdings donate one-sixth, the land hunger of the people could be adequately satisfied.

Vinobaji's target for land collection is certainly very big. The movement being God-inspired, who knows the landowners all over the country, might listen to the appeal of this messenger of peace and good-will. But the true success of Bhoodan does not lie in the fulfilment of the target. Its success will depend on the extent to which it transforms the sense of values, to be reflected in the behaviour of an individual towards another individual and the society as a whole. That indeed is the test, because Bhoodan, as

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

Mr. Jagjivan Ram, Minister for Communications, has put it, "is a veritable revolution in the social and moral values of life."

V

SOME persons have criticised the Land Gifts Mission on the ground that it tends to encourage fragmentation of land into tiny pieces. There is an element of truth in this criticism, because uneconomic holdings, as far as possible, should be avoided. Nevertheless, a dispassionate study of the real conditions in villages reveals certain facts which take away the sting from such criticism.

As stated in the preceding part, land in the villages generally consists of holdings which vary from 4.5 acres to 10 acres. Each one of these holdings is cultivated by its owner. But, the bigger plots are not cultivated by one person. They are sub-divided into numerous small plots and allotted for tillage by the landlord to his tenants. Since the produce is divided between the landowner and the tenant, the latter does not put his heart into cultivation. Needless to say, if the actual tiller were an owner of the small unit allotted to him for cultivation, he would work much harder as the reward of his work would entirely remain with him. The position of the landless labourer is still worse; he only gets his daily wage and has no interest in the produce. Consequently, he does not put in his maximum labour. Experience of the last five years has belied the fears that following fragmentation of holdings, the produce would register a fall. Production, on the other hand, has actually increased. This unexpected rise has been due to two factors. Firstly, the produce from the holding from which one-sixth was donated has remained the same as before, because the owner of the diminished holding worked more to maintain his standard of living. Secondly, the landless having got a small piece of land, after waiting for decades cultivated it like an inspired man to feed his family. Of course, none denies that if a landless labourer were given land equal in area to an economic holding, the yield would be much higher in proportion. But, what is the alternative? The land is limited and the number of persons who must be given land is much larger than visualised. Unless their land hunger is satisfied, the high ideals of the new social order will have no purpose in their lives. That is why Vinobaji says: "Fragmentation of hearts concerns me more than that of holdings." Let the critics of Bhoodan remember that even a tiny piece of land helps the landless to regain his social status as a self-reliant producer of wealth. Without a few acres of his own, he cannot feel the glow of economic freedom. It is

true that tilling of a small plot will not occupy him fully. His spare hours can be utilised by giving him employment in some cottage industry.

VI

THE question is often put: Why does not the Government enact legislation and thus bring about a just and proper redistribution of land? Vinobaji does not insist on such legislation, as the aim of the Bhoodan movement is not merely solving the land problem. The movement being an all-embracing one, its objective is to change the entire life itself. Through it, Mr. G.B. Pant says, "is being preached the law of love in place of the law of jungle." And love cannot be infused by legislation in the hearts of the people.

Vinobaji is so strict in pursuing the path he has chosen that when the Government about two years ago, offered him ten million acres of uncultivated land which had reverted to the State, he refused the offer saying that the land which belonged to the Government was the responsibility of the Government. He also made it clear that he had come not to organise but to disburse.

Although, Vinobaji does not lay emphasis on legislation for redistribution of land, yet he holds that he does not stand in the way of legislation. And explaining further the position of the Bhoodan Yajna vis-a-vis land reforms legislation, he says: "If, however, this does not satisfy you and you want more from me, I may tell you that whatever measure of success I may achieve in my work, it will surely facilitate the passing of such legislation. I am creating the atmosphere which will smoothen the way for it."

In these circumstances, what should be the attitude of the Government? Obviously, the Government cannot remain a silent spectator to the great non-violent revolution that is going on in the vast rural sector. Defining the position of the Government, the Prime Minister declares that "the movement has placed a responsibility on the Government to enact the necessary legislation for its success and help it in other ways." It is evident that Vinobaji's crusade cannot take the place of legislation in completely recasting the pattern of land ownership throughout the country. The magnitude of the problem creates that difficulty. For that reason Nehru asserts: "The Government's responsibility is not reduced by one jot as a result of the Bhoodan Yajna. The responsibility of the Central Government, as also of the State Governments, in solving the land problem remains, and has to be fully discharged."

It needs little emphasis to stress that the adoption of the new

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

socialist ideal has furthered the responsibility of the Government towards redistributing the land to the landless as quickly as possible. Such legislation will lay the solid foundations of the proposed egalitarian society. The structure of the new order must embody the economic needs and social aspirations of the people. The fondest desire gripping the heart of India's villages is, "give us land to cultivate." The fulfilment of this wish will take the country forward to its cherished goal of a humanitarian-democratic social order.

CHAPTER TWENTY-NINE

BUILDING FROM BELOW

This is the true joy in life, the being used for a purpose recognised by yourself as a mighty one; the being thoroughly worn out before you are thrown on the scrap heap; the being a force of Nature instead of a feverish selfish little clod of ailments and grievances complaining that the world will not devote itself to making you happy.

—GEORGE BERNARD SHAW: MAN AND SUPERMAN

IN the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society, the community development programme, which aims at increasing production, reducing inequalities and increasing the employment potential, is playing an historic part. Economic inertia which pervades an under-developed country, is being replaced by social dynamism. And, the lingering traces of colonial domination are being stamped off under the stimulus of regaining economic emancipation and social happiness. Alien domination had suppressed our rural sector so much that socially it just shrank within. Having lost all contact with progressive forces, social backwardness kept on increasing, as time rolled on. In consequence, rural India suffered from stagnation. Economy which had been static for generations had to be rejuvenated, if freedom was to have any meaning for the peasantry. Further, the people had to be activated for an organised effort towards social and economic welfare. And to-day the community development programme, by taking the message of scientific research and technology, coupled with the basic precepts of socialistic philosophy to the rural areas, is changing the attitudes of the rural population. The tide of new ideas, new thought and new approach is sweeping the vast countryside which had become a sluggish pool of fatalism and conservatism. As a result of this, a wave of intense activity is rushing through the veins of erstwhile slothful sleepy regions.

Now the peasants have started using modern agricultural techniques and improved implements. Along with the new methods of production, Mr. K.M. Pannikar, points out, "they are learning new habits of living and developing new bonds of social life." Their indifference towards their villages has given way to a desire to make them attractive by levelling the streets and filling up pits of stagnant water. By spreading the gospel

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

of self-betterment through self-help, the community schemes are creating new social values which are so essential in changing a petrified society into a living organism, in which man works for the good of the community and the community lives by the good of man. The development of a team spirit in national work, and the sense of social partnership in great undertakings, is the outstanding contribution of the community projects. It will not be wrong to say that these projects are rearing up new human beings.

Indeed, it is in the tremendous social revolution that is being wrought in rural India, that the real importance of community projects lies. The projects, as Dr. B.C. Roy, the West Bengal Chief Minister, tell us, "are the bright, vital and dynamic sparks all over India from which radiate rays of energy, hope and enthusiasm." Owing to the vitality of these projects, one-fourth of rural India is on the move, and consequently, the entire Indian economy has got a hopeful push forward.

The farmers no longer feel that they are just the forgotten factor in the national life of India. They have been made to realise that they have a vital role to play in reconstructing the present social order. Thus, an awareness of nationhood has been created in the rural areas which till recently suffered from a sense of frustration and acute isolationism. This new consciousness is making the peasantry understand its obligations towards the Welfare State. The manner in which these responsibilities are being discharged is at once the pride and glory of free India. The farmer realises, that he is not only the builder of his own village, but also the builder of the proposed egalitarian society. Under the impact of this new feeling, the traditional fatalism of the farmer has given birth to a new faith. This new faith is stirring millions of villagers to work like inspired beings. Labour and more labour has become their watchword, as they realise that without labour nothing can be achieved. "If you want knowledge," says Ruskin, "you must toil for it, and if pleasure, you must toil for it, toil is the law."

II

WHEN on October 2, 1952, a pilot scheme of 55 community projects was launched, a section of the people was sceptical about the possible success of the programme. Some thought that if illiteracy was removed, a new social outlook would develop itself, while others maintained that if the health of the villagers was improved, their inertia would disappear. Of course, the cynics doubted the success of the community projects, for they felt that

BUILDING FROM BELOW

the Government was incapable of arousing people's enthusiasm, and organising a mass popular movement. But, their fears have been completely falsified. Self-appointed prophets are trying to forget what they had dogmatised. It is high time that such doubting persons benefited from the advice of Heraclitus: "Let us not make random judgments on the greatest things." People have responded in a manner which has even astonished the most ardent supporters of the projects. Their contribution, both in cash and voluntary labour, has been magnificent. And what is most significant is the donation of land to construct roads, and buildings to house schools and hospitals. Peasants in every country are reluctant to part with their immovable property due to their deep-rooted attachment to it. Yet, the Indian farmer's social conscience has been so much aroused that he willingly surrenders some portion of his property for the promotion of social good.

After centuries of suffering and sorrow, people in the villages have got an opportunity to reconstruct their lives. They are fully availing themselves of this great opportunity because chance, according to the Greek dramatist, Sophocles, "never helps those who do not help themselves". Men and women, old and young, with shovels in their hands, have joined in the great crusade to fight the triple curse of hunger, disease and ignorance. The development of this community-mindedness provides the basis for the homogeneous social order, we wish to establish in India. It is this response from the people that has further strengthened the faith of our leaders in the efficacy of democratic methods in changing the socio-economic system of the country. Indeed, democracy itself, as Fosdick has said, "is based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people."

The response has been great because these projects are not just a carbon copy of some foreign scheme, but have been developed in India with Indian thinking, and keeping in view the local conditions and economic needs of the people. From the historical standpoint, the roots of the projects lie in the constructive work which the Congress has been doing for decades. The fact that the community development programme represents the correct approach to the solution of India's problem of rural welfare has been recognised by almost every country including Russia. The Leader of the Russian Team of Economists which recently visited India observed that "with the broad approach envisaged by the community programme to the country's problems, India would soon reconstruct itself socially and economically."

Another factor which has ensured the success of the community scheme is that it is not in any way a departmental plan. It is a movement to arouse among the people "a desire to live."

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

This consciousness has to be created, as continued foreign strangulation had almost killed even the urge to live like human beings. To millions in the British days, life had no meaning, no purpose, for they were just eking a sub-human existence. Once the community development programme enlivens the elemental right to live, the people themselves take the initiative and the Government assists them in their efforts to lead a richer and fuller life. "The office of Government," Channing rightly emphasises in *The Life and Character of Napoleon Bonapart*, "is not to confer happiness, but to give men opportunity to work out happiness for themselves." The programme being "a people's programme with Government's participation," the people feel that the programme is their own, and not something super-imposed by men sitting in the secretariat. The popular character of community projects has been appreciated by many foreign dignitaries. Mr. Chester Bowles, former American Ambassador in India, says: "In the old days government did things *to* people. Now government everywhere is striving to do things *for* people. But, to be fully effective, government must do things *with* people. I have been deeply interested with the awareness of this problem by those responsible for community development, and their efforts to stimulate this participation of the people."

During the British regime, the methods used being coercive, the people dreaded the very sight of Government servants. But to-day, officials instead of terrorising the villagers, are working with them shoulder to shoulder in making the village prosperous and a healthier and lovelier place to live in. This has brought into being a new bond between the farmers and Government agencies—a bond so essential in building up a truly classless society. Thanks to the community projects, a welfare administration able to implement the social objectives of a Welfare State has emerged. This change has been acknowledged by the United Nations Organisation. Referring to the administrative arrangements that have been made for the implementation of the community programme, a recent U.N. publication, entitled *Principles of Community Development*, says: "A significant aspect of the administrative arrangements is that it aims at the transformation of the existing general administrative structure into welfare cadres, rather than at the establishment of a separate and distinct welfare administration. This implies that the machinery which was at one time devised for revenue collection and maintenance of law and order, is being changed into a welfare administration, and the resources of all the development departments of the Government are being utilized to the maximum advantage for a concerted attack on the problem of rural development."

III

THE community development programme aims at revolutionising the entire social and economic life of the vast countryside by ensuring more production, less unemployment and more earnest co-operative effort through creating a psychology for planned development and quick execution thereof. Indeed, these projects give dynamism to any scheme that we have to work. Therefore, it is essential that the programme should work in its totality, and it should be seen that some of the items do not receive too much importance at the expense of others. If that care is not taken, the all-round social progress of the community will not be secured. To achieve this object, the community project administration should bear in mind the following points:

1. So far the project authorities have devoted a major portion of their time and energy to the development of agriculture. Communications have also been attended to, as most of the villages are not connected by roads. Improvements in agriculture and communications have been of great benefit to the peasantry. Now more attention should be paid to education, rural health and sanitation. As a matter of fact, in matters of health and sanitation, rural population has been most neglected for centuries. The project authorities should remember the dictum of Bacon that "a healthy body is a guest chamber for the soul and a sick body is a prison." With economic development going ahead, life is becoming more and more inter-dependent and due to that a corporate social pattern is emerging. In such an interlinked social system, the individual's health is regarded as a national asset. That being the social importance of personal health, in his book, *What is Civilization?* Mr. Will Durant has aptly stressed that "the health of nations is more important than the wealth of nations."

2. The rural sector suffers from seasonal unemployment and under-employment. To solve this problem, which imposes a heavy burden on the country's economy, household and small-scale industries should be organised in the project areas.

3. If villages are to have a new look, loans on a long term basis should be granted for rural housing. Our villages must not be, as Mr. Lionall Curtis once described them: "A collection of insanitary dwellings constructed on a dung hill." The best of improvements in agricultural methods and construction of finest roads will not serve their purpose, unless the homes are made of a decent standard. The significance of a good home is so much emphasised by George Gissing, that in *Rycroft Papers*, he writes: "Without home there is no civilization."

4. Specific programmes for the social and cultural benefit of women and children should be undertaken. That is essential,

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

as our village women are socially more static than the men even. National awareness must be quickened in them, if the rural community as a whole is to progress. "A nation cannot permanently remain on a level above the level of its women," says Ramsay in *Historical Commentary on the Galatians*.

5. It is true people living in the countryside have a strong religious bias against family planning and are in no mood to take to it favourably. Yet, a start in the direction of family planning has to be made and the sooner the project authorities show concern about this social question the better it would be. Of course, propaganda in favour of birth control has to be carefully done, lest it creates an adverse reaction among the people.

IV

THE work of the community projects has expanded so much—and that too, in such a short time—that there is a danger of inefficiency creeping in. An idea of the expansion can be had from the fact, that the population of the areas already covered is greater than the population of many European countries. Further, if all the community schemes being worked in Africa, South Asia and Middle East are added up, their magnitude will be less than that of what is being done in India. Slackness in every form has to be guarded against, because the happiness of our millions depends upon the proper working of the community schemes. Indeed, a slack administration is never able to arouse enthusiasm among the people. And, nothing great in this world can be achieved without enthusiasm. Even if the enthusiasm is there, as a result of the growing social awareness, efficient administration is needed to give that enthusiasm a positive social direction. Unless the energy of the people is properly harnessed for constructive purposes, it might be frustrated into tensions, and the pent-up tensions lead to social upheavals.

Since a responsible and responsive administration is of paramount importance for hastening "the evolutionary revolution" that is being set into motion by the community projects, the following points are further worth considering.

1. As the community development work is fast becoming a specialised job, officers at the top in the administration, should not be changed in the usual course.

2. The village level workers are the real backbone of the development programme. They are engaged in a most exciting adventure. Their importance is so great that Mr. Arthur Raper, Consultant Community Development Division, U. S. Government, expresses the view that "they would probably go down in

BUILDING FROM BELOW

history as one of the great social inventions of the present era." Truly, they are the crusaders to free rural India from the shackles of illiteracy, disease and poverty. Never in the field of social uplift (to use the words of Churchill) was "so much owed by so many to so few." That being so, utmost vigilance should be observed in selecting the workers. As far as possible, townsmen should not be recruited because people brought up in the urban areas find it difficult to adjust themselves to the village environment.

3. Men working in the project areas are still experimenting and learning. This is logical, for they have to deal with every aspect of the villager's life, and build up the community as a whole. Therefore, knowledge gained in working of different projects should be shared. For this, inter-project, inter-district and inter-State visits have to be encouraged to facilitate free exchange of ideas and knowledge.

4. When the projects are extended to the yet uncovered areas, a large number of agricultural experts and technicians will be needed. Since we have decided to train our own experts and depend less and less on those from abroad, our trainees should be given the best of education. Those in charge of training institutions must bear in mind the warning of Nehru that "if the quality of education deteriorated, it would bring down the standard of experts and India would become a second rate country."

5. At the district level, co-ordination is usually lacking in implementing the programme. This dampens the enthusiasm of the people, and thus the purpose of the scheme to that extent, gets defeated. It is essential that the administrative machinery should work as a unit responsive to the needs of the people. In addition to that, inter-departmental co-ordination at the secretariat level must be spontaneous and not halting. Top officials should always remember that anything that hampers co-ordination, however justified by rules of procedure, adversely affects the fortunes of millions whose pressing problems require immediate solution.

6. Greater respect, and powers for initiative, should be given to the Advisory Committees; then alone they would be able to collaborate with the villagers and constructive workers on a broader basis for achieving better results.

7. There is real danger to the benefits accruing from public works being lost if adequate provision is not made for their regular maintenance. The local authorities should, therefore, be put under statutory obligation to look after roads, buildings, tanks and the like.

8. The success of the community schemes lies in the co-operation of the people. To get this co-operation to the maximum, the service of all social agencies should be secured.

9. Utmost care has to be taken to safeguard against the setting in of stagnation after the first flush of enthusiasm created

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

by the community development programme. To maintain the interest of villagers in various schemes in all their phases, Farmers' Clubs in large numbers should be organised. That is essential, because in the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society, we have to look to the countryside to throw up leadership and provide a broad human base to social democracy.

CHAPTER THIRTY

DISPERSAL OF DEMOCRACY

If liberty and equality, as is thought by some are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike, share in the Government to the utmost.

—ARISTOTLE : POLITICS

THE new socialist pattern that we are trying to evolve is not to be based on any set dogmas. Since we are pragmatic and not dogmatic in formulating our social policies, we accept whatever is good in different political systems and reject what does not fit in with the Indian conditions, or is against our traditions. Traditions, in spite of their age, have a social dynamism of their own. If we venture to introduce any foreign beliefs which clash with our heritage, the nation's smooth advance is bound to be impeded. This will happen, as the past is always with us. In this respect, Bergson, the French philosopher, in *Creative Evolution*, writes : "The present contains nothing more than the past, and what is found in the effect, was already in the cause." If we look at the history of various nations, we find that their social development has been more or less one continuous process. A few nations, of course, in their zeal to modernise their social systems, tried to leap over their cultural standards. But the experiment has not been very fruitful. Their social structures suffered from instability, because they lacked historical cohesion. Rightly has Browning said :

*If we tried
To sink the past beneath our feet, be sure
The future would not stand.*

II

WE have rejected totalitarianism, as through extreme centralisation of power, it brings about regimentation of the masses. Instead of giving any freedom and initiative to the individual to develop his personality, authoritarianism aims at controlling all aspects of his life. Man has to think, move and act as the State desires him to do. Admittedly, it raises economic standards. Yet, that is not enough.

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

We have accepted democracy as the basis of our political philosophy, for it is in conformity with the genius of our people, and the Indian temperament leans heavily in favour of government by suasion. Its great advantage lies in the fact that while it mobilises social resources to speed up economic progress, it does not put fetters around individual freedom. This liberty has to be preserved, because in the words of Ingersoll, "what light is to the eyes, what air is to the lungs, what love is to the heart, liberty is to the soul of man." Unfortunately, democracy too, as it has come to stay in the West, has begun to show certain tendencies towards centralisation. If this tendency is not checked in time, Western democracy might imperceptibly move towards authoritarianism. And that, indeed, will be a sad day for humanity.

India is a very poor country, economically under-developed, socially backward and militarily not very strong. Yet, it seems that destiny has placed great responsibility on her. Under the leadership of Nehru, she is showing to the world what real democracy means, and how it should function as an instrument of social liberation. This she is doing by evolving the novel model of decentralised democracy, which means diffusing the social, economic, administrative and judicial functions of the State, and transferring them to the village community councils. This policy is inspired by the realisation that genuine democracy cannot be worked by a handful of men from New Delhi.

Through a deliberate process of decentralisation, we are trying to build up a truly democratic Welfare State. Such a State fulfils the two attributes of a progressive society—central control and individual and group initiative—which have been enunciated by Bertrand Russell. Control is essential as without it there is anarchy. Initiative is allowed because without it there is stagnation. Decentralisation of power is such an article of faith with the Congress that idealising this objective, it was specifically laid down in the Constitution, that "the State shall take steps to organise village panchayats as units of self-government." These elected village bodies furnish a strong, sound base to the structure of democracy. The reason being that our rural population has an instinctive urge to function as collective communities. It is this traditional genius in living a corporate life that has always provided a cementing force to our civilization. "The strength and perseverance of India in the past," Nehru says, "seem to have been in her widespread system of village republics, or self-governing panchayats." Gandhiji's faith in the ideal that Indian independence must begin at the bottom was so deep that he emphatically stated: "To me the organisation of village life and the practical autonomy of small local centres are more important than either provincial autonomy or central responsibility; and if the choice lay between

DISPERSAL OF DEMOCRACY

the two, I would unhesitatingly accept the autonomy of local centres."

III

TO the modern world, this experiment of vesting village communities with power to manage their own affairs, as a measure to achieve the social ideals of democracy, might look something new. Still, in India, it only means reviving a system which has existed since times immemorial. These village republics were so much an integral part of the socio-economic framework of India, that till the days of the East India Company, they kept on performing their functions. Sir Percival Griffiths, in his book, *The British Impact on India*, tells us that because of these small self-governing republics "civic conscious was strong and the way of life in rural India was gracious." Kingdoms rose and empires fell, yet these local republics remained untouched by foreign invasions and political upheavals. This peculiar characteristic of village units enabled the common people to insulate the affairs of their daily life from big political changes. Nehru, in *Glimpses of World History*, writes: "Kings came and went, or quarrelled with each other but they did not touch or interfere with this village system or ventured to take away from the liberties of the panchayats." Discussing the working of the village communities through the ages, Sir Charles Metcalfe maintains that they "seemed to last where nothing else lasts." It was the British policy of centralizing political and economic power that struck a heavy blow to well-organised village communities. And the British method of revenue collection was so ruthless that these ancient republics could not stand the shock of the revenue collection machine. As a result of these repressive measures, the village organisations which had made the pattern of civil life graceful and homogeneous, collapsed. Still, the spirit which animated them did not perish. It pulsed in every village family; only the organised medium to express itself was not there. Thus, the Congress decision to revive village panchayats, is not only in keeping with the ancient traditions of India, but is in pursuance of its objective of casting a social mechanism, in which the largest number of people are given an opportunity to participate "in the business of administration and other aspects of community life—social, economic and political."

The revival of village panchayats means the creation of a countrywide net-work of vital agencies to ensure the social progress and economic development of the vast rural sector. Some people feel that we are just wasting our time in reanimating village panchayats, which are nothing but "relics of tribalism," and

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

were meant only for a medieval society. It is wrong to say that these panchayats are "relics of tribalism." Till a few centuries back, they were vigorous local bodies, and did useful work in the life of India. It is unfair to belittle the achievements of ancient institutions. "People who take no pride in the noble achievements of their remote ancestors," Macaulay warns us, "will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered with pride by remote descendants." Besides, the village panchayats are not being revived in the same old form in which they used to function. Their pattern is being changed to meet the requirements of modern India. To be precise, the village panchayats are being made into live organs of administration, because historically, culturally and geographically, they constitute the best form of local administration.

The strength of Indian democracy can never be in a centralised authority; it must rest in small well-knit units. Therefore, properly functioning village communities will make democracy a broad-based socio-economic organism, instead of remaining the handmaid of certain interests and classes. This fact has been recognised by modern social thinkers, who feel that a bold policy of decentralisation must be pursued to save democracy from the perils of too much concentration of power. To-day, the functions of a State have enlarged, and as social awareness increases, they will enlarge still further. It stands to reason that all these welfare functions cannot be performed by a single centralised State machine. Small autonomous units must be created to meet the institutional essentials of this new responsibility. In order to make these self-governing bodies dynamic, the State must give them all the help and guidance. And, a State which does all these things can become a true social State, because that Government, says Goethe, is the best which teaches us to govern ourselves.

Moreover, by establishing panchayats we create a powerful agency to speed up development work. Already in rural revival of form and spirit, these units of self-government are playing a conspicuous role. The people are being given an opportunity to plan according to their needs, and in the execution of these plans, they exercise their initiative to the maximum of their capacities. The masses also feel that a Welfare State based on a socialistic economy, is not meant just for the few living in towns, but that they can build their own village socialism in their own way. India being a predominantly agricultural country, these small units of agrarian idealism serve the purpose of numerous foundation stones to the new edifice of a socialist society.

Since village panchayats are meant to act as strong base to social democracy, it is essential that they should function smoothly and efficiently. Truly, the panchayats are to-day becoming the basis

DISPERSAL OF DEMOCRACY

of all administration in the country. If the system works well, the whole country will make rapid progress, and administrative efficiency will also greatly improve. Conversely, if the working of the panchayats goes defective, the benefits of welfare economics will not reach the countryside in a full and proper manner. This will create social tension which no true Welfare State can afford to have.

IV

ALMOST all the States have by legislation created panchayats. But, that is not enough. They must be made, as Prof. Shriman Narayan suggests, "effective instruments of administrative and judicial decentralisation, as well as of national economic planning." In case they become mere ornamental bodies, then people might lose faith in democracy. The villagers are too far away to see the functioning of democracy in Parliament and State Assemblies. They have panchayats as the only real manifestation of the democratic experiment. Keeping all these points in view, the Congress Village Panchayat Committee rightly recommended that "in the present conditions of backwardness and illiteracy in our villages, the State will largely have to foster their growth. Once the village communities have been allotted a specific place in our social organism, it becomes essential to supervise their work without in any way interfering in their basic functions."

If the State helps in the creation of sound leadership in villages, these panchayats can become vital agencies for establishing a broad-based egalitarian society by securing social justice to the forgotten man, and promoting a feeling of oneness and brotherhood in the community. Corporate life, thus created, will help in eliminating acquisitive tendencies in the individual, and reshaping their values and attitudes on socialistic lines. The way for removing gross social inequalities and economic disparities will, thereby be paved. Enabling the panchayats to become organic institutions for harmony in village life, it is of utmost importance that the political parties should keep away from them. Political parties are based on differences, and the introduction of politics will turn the village communities into a battlefield of conflicting ideologies and beliefs. These panchayats should be recognised as non-political units doing social development and cultural work.

Elections are an integral part of democracy; they provide an opportunity to the people to express their opinion freely. This right to express opinion is considered sacred because, as Jefferson has put it, "all authority belongs to the people." Still, elections

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

have their own limitations; sometimes the most deserving people are not elected. Therefore, to have the best persons, the system of unanimity should be introduced. Of course, it cannot be done by law. Nevertheless, the principle of unanimity will be encouraged if it is laid down, that a panchayat elected unanimously will have more powers than a panchayat elected on the basis of majority votes. Unanimity is all the more imperative, for then alone the panchayat will command full confidence of the people, and be in a position to rally them round, in various rural reconstruction activities. As it is, the rural sector due to its social backwardness and low economic level, suffers greatly from the handicap of diverse inequalities. Needless to emphasise, if we introduce a new kind of disparity in loyalties based on majority and minority distinctions, our task of removing other disparities will become more difficult. Disparities have a chain reaction. One disparity leads to another. Let us avoid them in the case of our village councils.

Democracy is still in the process of evolution; a few centuries are nothing in the growth of a political system. "Stateless society" is the ideal that some social thinkers have placed before themselves. In such a society, democracy will find its final consummation. Decentralisation of power is a step towards the goal of a Stateless society, as the State in a decentralised social system, governs the least. Panchayats are a creation of decentralisation, and their work is being watched by lovers of democracy. They constitute the laboratory in which the experiment of decentralised democracy is being tried. The acceptance of the principle of unanimity will ensure that success and the concept of composite democracy, in place of party democracy, will become a reality. This new phase will give a new meaning to decentralised democracy, and indeed, a new purpose to democracy itself.

CHAPTER THIRTY-ONE

PARTNERSHIP ENSURES PROSPERITY

Other things being equal, the most vigorous social systems are those in which are combined the most effective subordination of the individual to the interests of the social organism, with the highest development of his own personality.

—BENJAMIN KIDD: SOCIAL EVOLUTION

IN a socialistic pattern of society, the individual must feel that his interests are indetical with those of the society. If the individual and the community pull in different directions, there is bound to be imbalance in the social scales. Disraeli laid down an important social maxim when he said: "It is a community of purpose that constitutes society." Therefore, it becomes the duty of socialist planners to create conditions for the proper development of an intergated social outlook of the individual. Mere propaganda asking people to think socially is not enough. Propaganda has its usefulness in bringing about the desired social climate. But social conscience of the people only becomes alive if they themselves see the benefits of common effort. The finest opportunity for this common endeavour can be provided by the co-operative movement, which should occupy a place of pride in a socialistic economy. Indeed, "common good through common endeavour," should be our slogan in the nation's march to its egalitarian goal.

The greatness of the co-operative movement lies in the fact that it constitutes the middle course between unrestricted private enterprise and rigid State ownership. Both these extreme forms of economic activity suffer from inherent disadvantages. These drawbacks have been aptly described by Aldous Huxley when he says: "Capitalism tends to produce a multiplicity of petty dictators, each in command of his own little business kingdom. State socialism tends to produce a single, centralised totalitarian dictatorship wielding absolute authority over all its subjects through a hierarchy, or bureaucratic agents."

Since in the co-operative movement the individuals voluntarily form an association for the achievement of common economic ends, and bring into this combination a moral effort and obligation, the Planning Commission has commended "the adoption of co-operative method for various forms of economic activity." This emphasis on the co-operative method is understandable

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

because while it harnesses the constructive side of private initiative, it eliminates the capitalistic element of exploitation. Thus, the cause of social justice through the initiative and co-operative efforts of the people is advanced, and the warning of Lord Russell that "the lack of opportunity for personal initiative is one of the great dangers of the modern world" is properly heeded. Further, purposeful co-operation brings the individual nearer the State, and the State instead of functioning as a governing entity, works in partnership with the individual. It takes nothing from him, but helps him in every way to improve his economic status. This benevolent State association with the individual is the foundation on which the edifice of social democracy is to be built in India.

It is rather unfortunate that in spite of its high social ideals and manifold economic advantages, the progress of the co-operative movement has been far from satisfactory. The latest verdict on the movement has been passed by the Evaluation Report on the working of the Community Projects. The Report says: "It is a depressing thought that in by far the larger number of States, little should have been done in promoting co-operation even in the more familiar channels of rural credit." Notwithstanding, the little progress that the movement has made, the Rural Credit Survey Committee maintains that "there is no alternative to the adoption of the co-operative basis for the organisation of credit and economic activities in the country."

One of the causes of the unsatisfactory working of the co-operative movement is that it has not received the care and attention that it deserved. No effort worth the name has been made to propagate the social aims and economic benefits of the movement. At best, the people have been told that in matters of financial assistance, the State would extend help to a co-operative society more willingly than to an individual. But this readiness to advance loans is only an insignificant part of the movement. Co-operation has a social philosophy which covers all aspects of human activity. Co-operation stands for the elimination of all manner of exploitation from our lives. "The aim of co-operation," the Union Railway Minister, Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri, tells us, "is to educate people in the art of thinking together, living together and working together." The good of the individual, it teaches, lies in the good of the community. If the social significance of this dictum is fully appreciated, it will be a step forward in the direction of the ideal of true fellowship. Emphasising the urgency to establish an unbreakable feeling of kinship, in his poem, *Brotherhood*, Mr. Edwin Markham, the American poet, says:

*The crest and crowning of all good,
Life's final star, is Brotherhood.*

PARTNERSHIP ENSURES PROSPERITY

The philosophy of the co-operative movement being so noble, it becomes imperative to study its rise and fall critically. Such a dispassionate analysis of the working of the movement will enable us to benefit from past experience. Moreover, knowledge of past events brings maturity in social thinking. The Roman statesman, Cicero, was not indulging in any exaggeration when he expressed the view that "not to know what has been transacted in former times is to continue always a child." In studying the history of the movement, it is dangerous to depend exclusively upon the report of Registrars. They usually give fanciful picture because they are interested parties.

II

IN 1904, the co-operative movement in India, under the leadership of Mr. J. McNeil and Mr. C.C. Campbel, had its birth. The law was mainly based on the English Friendly Societies Act. Its objective was "to deal with the stagnation of the poor classes, and more specially, with the agriculturists who constitute the bulk of the population." The decision to initiate the movement was described by Mr. Wolfe as "a turning point in India's social and economic history." Registrars were appointed in big provinces to organise co-operative societies. The policy of the Government was to form a limited number of model societies, whose smooth and efficient working would convince the people of the advantages of co-operation. It was hoped that the people themselves would take the initiative and organise themselves into co-operative organisations. The Registrar was only to register formally societies formed by the people. Sadly enough, the hope that the people would take the movement into their own hands, could not be realised. In consequence, Government officials became nervous, as they thought they would be reprimanded for the slow progress of the movement. Since their next promotion largely depended on the increase in the number of co-operative societies, they got busy in organising new societies and paid little attention to supervising the societies that were already functioning. The number of societies did increase but the quality of their working suffered. The members of the newly formed societies were not given proper education in the economics, or the social significance of co-operation. The poor working of the societies made the people lose faith in the very utility of co-operative effort. The Maclagan Committee appointed in 1914, was so much upset over this sorry state of affairs that it categorically recommended that "utmost care should be exercised in permitting the formation of a society, and the Registrar should only consent to register a society after he is

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

convinced that its prospective members understood co-operative principles and duties."

Unfortunately, this recommendation remained on paper only, and the officials with an eye on numbers alone, kept on registering new societies. With the prosperity that the First World War brought to the agriculturists, the number of credit societies increased at a tremendous rate. Considering that prosperity had come to stay, the Government in a generous manner kept on advancing loans to credit societies, without inquiring into the capacity of the members to pay back. The unprecedented advance that the movement made can be gauged from the fact that while in 1912, the number of credit societies was just 8,000, it shot up to 80,000 in 1928. As loans had been advanced beyond the capacity of the members to repay, recovery of advances became almost impossible. So serious was the situation, that a large number of societies had to go into liquidation. The Government decided to stop further registration of credit societies until the loans already advanced had been recovered. Yet, the official enthusiasm for increasing the number of societies found expression in organising non-credit societies. Their number increased from 15,000 in 1930 to 45,000 in 1950. In view of the fact that these societies had also not been organised on the basic principles of co-operation, their fate was none better than that of credit societies.

III

HAVING seen the various phases through which the co-operative movement has passed, we have to find ways and means to make it dynamic, so that it becomes a worthy vehicle of social progress. In the present complex economic system, an average individual by himself cannot procure all the resources for the efficient running of a production unit; it is only group action that can yield the maximum results. It may be mentioned here, that more than a hundred years ago, Mazzini, the Italian patriot, realising the social significance of changing times had laid down: "The epoch of individuality is concluded, and it is the duty of reformers to initiate the epoch of association. Collective man is omnipotent upon the earth he treads." The concept of co-operation, therefore, must become the motive force of the social organism, if democracy is to fulfil its high purpose in socialising Indian economy. It is for this reason that the Planning Commission asserts that "the co-operative form can no longer be treated as a species within the private sector. It is an indispensable instrument of planned economic action in democracy."

The task of invigorating the co-operative movement and

PARTNERSHIP ENSURES PROSPERITY

making it the spring for social action is certainly difficult. But the harder the task, the nobler is the call. To make the co-operative movement more vigorous and broad based, the following suggestions are offered for cool consideration.

1. The people should be educated in the philosophy of co-operation. The presumption that the co-operative movement has succeeded in the West, so it must succeed here as well, is not enough. Indeed, such thinking has to be avoided, because it brings about complacency, and if there is anything that retards progress, it is self-complacency. Study circles should be organised in different centres. Suitable literature on the general principles of co-operation must be produced and distributed at cost price. In fact, the desirability of introducing co-operation as a subject in our schools and colleges, should be examined. The co-operative movement is not something alien to India; the very basis of the joint Hindu family has been co-operation. If the masses of the people are approached properly, the response to co-operation is likely to be great.

2. The State so far has been a silent spectator in the development of co-operative movement. The State must give up the role of a passive observer, and become an active partner in all phases of the movement. Of course, care has to be taken that the movement does not become too much officialised. Still, the authority of the Government, in matters of audit and supervision, must be much more than at present. While the initiative should remain with the people, State guidance must be readily available. "On the harmonious blending of people's initiative and State direction," says Mr. Jagjivan Ram, the Union Minister for Communications, "depends the success of co-operative movement." To achieve that end, the State should function as an active partner, and not as a bureaucratic controller.

3. As far as possible, Government aid should be given to co-operatives in preference to individuals. This will make the people realise that the Government puts the highest priority on co-operative ways of organising life. In this respect, the Economic Programme Committee of the Congress, seven years ago, had recommended that "no State aid should be allowed to an individual except through his co-operative society."

4. Till now most of the activities of the co-operative movement have been confined to the field of agriculture only. The movement should now embrace every form of economic activity. This expansion will be a major step in the direction of common ownership and distributive justice. For this, there should be a properly phased programme.

5. Credit has been the dominant feature of the co-operative movement's programme so far. Towards satisfying the new

socialist aspirations of the people, the movement should infiltrate into the non-credit sector, and promote voluntary associations of individuals having common needs. To be precise, the co-operative movement must become both a business and a human movement. In realising that objective, multi-purpose social and economic welfare organisations should be formed. Emphasising the comprehensive social purpose of co-operation, the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan holds that "co-operation in all forms and in all activities is to be welcomed, because the habit and outlook of co-operation is as important as the forms through which it is expressed." It may be recalled that the Congress realising the restricted scope of the co-operative movement, in its 1945 Election Manifesto, had declared that "co-operatives should also be organised for purposes other than giving credit facilities, both in the rural and urban areas."

6. As regards the administrative side of the movement, the Government must appoint only those officers who have a thorough knowledge of the principles of co-operation. Registration of a society should not be treated as a mere formality by the Registrar. He should call a meeting of the members of the proposed society and find out whether the members know the social purpose and economic aims of co-operation. If their knowledge is insufficient, proper education must be given to them. The Registrar has also to satisfy himself that in its working the society will not exploit others, and that it is based on true co-operative principles. Since a large number of societies are either not working satisfactorily, or have ceased to function, the Registrar should thoroughly enquire into the possibility of the success of a proposed society. Only after satisfying himself with the three above-mentioned conditions, he should register the new society.

7. What should be done with the societies which are lying in an almost dormant state? An inquiry should be held about the affairs of such societies, and if it is found that there are no reasonable chances of their being revived into active units, they should be scrapped by the Government. Such a drastic step is essential for two reasons. Firstly, the Government aid to the defunct will be just wasted and, secondly, the time and energy of the staff spent in supervising them will be saved. Thus, State assistance and the time of the staff will be more profitably utilised in raising the stature of societies doing good work.

8. As the co-operative movement is to be expanded with a view to covering all aspects of economic activity, the Government should provide training facilities in different crafts. The need for such facilities becomes all the more urgent, because with the Government's decision to give small-scale industries an important place in socialistic planning, co-operative societies for the

PARTNERSHIP ENSURES PROSPERITY

manufacture of handicrafts are getting formed in large numbers.

9. A cadre of co-operative workers, well-trained in the mechanism of running co-operative societies, should be formed from the village level workers upwards. This trained personnel can help the co-operative institutions in running efficiently.

10. Expert advice from foreign countries should be sought in vitalising the movement. The broad objectives of the movement being of a universal character, experience of other countries could be profitably utilised.

11. The functions of village panchayats and co-operative organisations in the sphere of rural development have to be outlined, as far as possible. There should neither be any rivalry between these two popular agencies, nor overlapping of duties. Discussing the respective roles of panchayats and co-operative societies, the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan says: "Co-operatives, like village panchayats, are institutional agencies for achieving social cohesion. The primary co-operative society and the village panchayat have to work in unison, if the needs of all the families in the village are to be met."

CHAPTER THIRTY-TWO

OBLIGATIONS OF OFFICE

Public morality requires that a subordinate should be supported in difficulty always, in error sometimes, in crime never.

—GOLDWIN SMITH: THREE ENGLISH STATESMEN

AS human society becomes more socially civilized, obligations of the State towards the people, increase both in number and magnitude. The State, instead of remaining content with maintaining law and order, and guaranteeing security for business, assumes the role of a universal protector. Indeed, in a highly developed Welfare State, the scope of social services is not just confined to measures against disease, or the eradication of illiteracy. These benefits are not extended in any spirit of charity; they represent the fulfilment of well-defined social responsibility of the Government to the community. This is the correct position because Government, as Burke has said, "is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants."

A Welfare State is, in fact, a considerable instalment towards socialism in our time. It embodies the "national minimum" of health, education, physical subsistence and employment opportunities to all members of society. It endeavours, in a comprehensive manner, to promote the well-being of the people who suffer from social handicaps and economic disadvantages. The ultimate objective of all beneficent activities is to create conditions in which individual handicaps are removed and basic needs of the people satisfied in a generous manner. All this means a tremendous increase in the functions and duties of the State. While the State translates its social policies into welfare services through its executive organisation, it is of paramount importance that the administration attunes itself to the growing obligations of the State towards its citizens. In reality, the dynamic impulse for speedy action and high efficiency should be kept alive in the administrative machinery. New methodology with its latest techniques must be adopted in implementing public utility programmes. Needless to emphasise, with the civil services showing any slackness, the finest of social policies will prove abortive, and the living conditions of the millions will continue as pitiable as ever. Rightly it has been said that inefficiency in administration hits citizens at every limb.

Therefore, with our avowal to establish a socialistic society which aims at revolutionising the life of the socially handicapped

and economically under-privileged, dynamism of the outlook and approach of the services is both urgent and essential. In the new social order, the conduct of our civil servants ought to be guided by their conscience which means putting in of maximum effort, and making the fullest use of their ability to advance the cause of social justice. The reason for this progressive social attitude has been stressed by the 19th century American statesman, Henry Clay, when he says: "Government is a trust and the officers of the Government are trustees; both the trust and the trustees are created for the benefit of the people."

II

IT goes to the credit of our civil services that when India regained her freedom, they unreservedly transferred their loyalty to the new Government. Officers who used to put Congress leaders into jails started taking orders from them when they took charge of the administration. This readjustment on the part of Government servants was indeed a miracle. Appreciating the co-operative attitude of the civil services, Mr. U.N. Dhebar affirms that "progress of the country would not have been possible but for their spirit of accommodation." At that time many persons advocated that the "henchmen of British Imperialism" should be replaced by party men. Since patriotism is not necessarily a substitute for administrative knowledge, it was decided to integrate the services into the new pattern of parliamentary democracy. Moreover, the peaceful transference of power had cast a moral responsibility on the Government of not creating radical changes in the old executive machine. It is only in countries where revolutions are brought about by methods of violence and bloodshed that members of the victorious party take charge of the key posts in the administration. But, for the day-to-day running of the Government, even the communist countries have utilized most from the former administrative set-up for their own ends. There is nothing surprising in such a step, for what matters is public loyalty and not personal beliefs. "The State," declared Cromwell over three centuries ago, "in choosing men to serve it, takes no notice of their opinions. If they be willing faithfully to serve it, that satisfies."

Experience of the last nine years has convincingly proved that the retention of well-trained services has been of great benefit to India. This advantage can be better appreciated, if we look, as Dr. B.C. Roy, the West Bengal Chief Minister, puts it, "at countries round about us who have suffered because of the lack of that advantage." If civil servants have not been able to identify them-

selves fully with the new needs and requirements of a resurgent society, it is because they were trained for a different purpose. The purpose was, specifically, the maintenance of public order and limited to the collection of revenues from the people. As to what happened to the people was not their concern. In our criticism, therefore, we should show restraint, as indiscriminate condemnation of the services tends to demoralise them. Again, unnecessary bitterness surcharges the atmosphere, and their attempt towards moulding themselves to the new democratic framework gets frustrated. The basic canons of democracy require that the services should not be dragged into public controversy, as the ultimate responsibility of all administrative actions lies on the Minister concerned. The doctrine of Ministerial responsibility can be well appreciated by the prompt manner in which Sir Thomas Dugdale, Minister for Agriculture, in Sir Winston Churchill's Cabinet, resigned when a cultivating owner was dispossessed of his land by the Permanent Commissioner of Crown Lands. The Minister, in no way, was responsible for this unjust act of the civil servant. Yet, he decided to relinquish his high office because the ultimate responsibility of running the administration was his. This healthy tradition of a Minister's responsibility has been reemphasised by the Union Home Minister, Mr. G.B. Pant. Speaking in the Lok Sabha, he said: "Let there be no carping criticism of members of the services. If there is anything wrong, let the responsibility be squarely placed on my shoulders. I am here to bear it so long as you allow me to be here. But, let them be saved from criticism, for which they are not responsible, but for which I am answerable, having allowed them to function in that way. I hope that the democratic way of approach will assert itself in the day-to-day regulation of public affairs in this House or outside."

In a true social State, the services should be regarded as a limb of the co-operative enterprise in spreading the net-work of welfare measures. There should be "no room for any difference or distinction between people, Ministers or services." While we should try to maintain the dignity of the services, and show them the respect they deserve, they on their part ought to "establish that emotional concord with the common man which would enable them to share the joys and sorrows with him without any effort, and in a spontaneous way." These days, as Nehru has pointed out, "a vast gulf separates the ordinary people from the officials and they approach the problems of the common man with a coat and neck-tie and collar mind." Civil servants should realise that they are not a separate class for enjoying special privileges. The ruling mentality has to give way to enthusiasm for service. The interests of the poorest people must be given top-most

priority. Disraeli in his book, *Vivian Grey*, rightly observes that "all power is a trust; that we are accountable for its exercise; that from the people and for the people all springs, and all must exist." That is why in the Indian Republic, even the President is considered as the first servant of the public. The distinction between the ruler and the ruled having vanished, the services have to think more of their social duties and less of their individual status and rights. Their rights have been safeguarded by the Constitution, and security of service guaranteed. "But a real servant," the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, tells us, "needs no safeguards, and that our ideal should be service, and through service to make our rights secure." As a matter of fact, in the new socialistic society every citizen, whatever be his social position and avocation, should feel that his rights are safe and secure. This is a moral necessity. "A State," Hugo Grotius, the distinguished jurist, holds, "is a perfect body of free men, united together to enjoy common rights and advantages."

Formerly, the services suffered from a conflict between loyalty to the Government and duty to their country. But since our independence, that conflict has been resolved. Now they have got the great opportunity for functioning in a real way, in the big task of building the new social system on a just and equitable basis. In the British days, the services were cut off from the life currents of society, and lacked social contact. Now they have to develop the supreme quality of humanism. With our determination to establish a humanitarian-democratic order, in which all men and women, shall have equal opportunities to lead a fuller and richer life, the Sarvodaya spirit *i.e.*, the well-being of all, should permeate the administrative set-up. Unless the executive turns itself into a social welfare mechanism. It will be difficult to bring about a peaceful revolution in the social and economic spheres. Keeping all these things in view, Prof. Paul Appleby, the renowned American expert on general administration, in his report, *Public Administration in India*, writes: "Here in India, special need and opportunity exist for the development of administrative theory dealing with the two outstanding desires of the current Indian society—towards democracy and towards the Welfare State. Democratic public administration is not, and should not be, merely public administration under the direction and control of leaders democratically chosen and held responsible. And public administration in a Welfare State faces needs for learning, never so compelling at any other time and place."

III

THE social aims and economic objectives of the proposed social-

istic society have so much captivated the minds of the people, that they are becoming impatient for reaching the egalitarian goal. This impatience is due to the fact that they have suffered enough from the rigours of disparities, which men at the top of social hierarchy, had created for their own ends. In reality, there is notably an urge among the people for achieving in a decade what was attained in a century by the advanced countries. The desire to live a better life shows the new vitality of the nation. If this new enthusiasm among the people is not properly channelised towards systematic social effort, frustration will invade their minds and they will lose faith in the administration. No Welfare State can afford that psychosis to prevail because, in the words of Lincoln, "if you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem." The people keenly look forward to the implementation of various development schemes which aim at raising their living standards. These schemes provide an opportunity to the administration to reach the heart of the forgotten man and foster emotional integration between the masses of the people and the State. It is an indisputable fact that many development projects, for whose success the people were willing to work on a voluntary basis, and for which money had been sanctioned, have been held up because of the complicated and elaborate rules of procedure. As the scope of the Second Five-Year Plan has been enlarged on all fronts, the warning of Prof. P.C. Mahalanobis that "administrative difficulties inherent in the existing Government machinery are likely to prove the greatest obstacle to efficient planning," should be properly taken note of, and the executive machinery geared up to top efficiency.

The rules of business are so detailed and confining that initiative and imagination are at a discount in the long-drawn process. It cannot be denied that in the labyrinth of complex secretariat procedure, the ablest and the sincerest officials fail to find their way through. In our secretariat, because of its peculiar working, there is what, Mr. Robert Hall, the English divine, once called, "an incessant motion, but no progress." Too much stress on administrative formalities makes the Governmental machinery rigid and unresponsive to the urgency of needs in a fast moving progressive society. Since the rules, regulations and conventions were framed long before independence for a limited purpose, and were conceived in a different political context, it has now become socially essential that they should be revised with a view to making the executive machinery an appropriate instrument for rapid action.

The need for overhauling the present administrative system and gearing up its efficiency becomes all the more imperative, as

OBLIGATIONS OF OFFICE

the Government is entering more and more the field of production. Many public enterprises have already been started, and to run them properly, a well-trained personnel is required. If these undertakings do not yield the desired results, people's faith in the public sector, which is the mainstay of socialised economy, will be shaken, and the trend towards capitalism will reassert itself. The management of State enterprises being a specialised job, a special cadre for managerial work should be recognised as of prime necessity.

IV

At present, red tapism is so strangling and diversion of responsibility is so widespread, that the secretariat has been aptly described by Nehru as an administrative jungle. In the secretarial hierarchy, dawdling files with noting and counter-noting, move up and down, and more often than not, get stuck in untraceable nooks of officialese routine. Consequently, the difficult task of decision taking gets miserably postponed. The notorious system of "passing the buck" lowers the tempo and efficiency of work. A file, according to secretariat tradition, is an invitation to somnolence and not an incitement to action. Endless perambulation of files increases the cost of administration as well, with so much time spent on noting by the staff, every minute of whose time is paid for. In a Welfare State, the Government must be cost-conscious, as every penny is needed for the pushing forward of development schemes. Now that India has gained its independence, our civil servants should remember the words of President, Calvin Coolidge, that "after order and liberty, economy is one of the highest essentials of a free Government." The Planning Commission attaches so much importance to the desirability of spending public money properly, that in the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan it says: "At all levels within the administration an outlook should be developed which will insist on avoiding waste, assessing costs in relation to benefits and ensuring that the country gets the utmost from the expenditure which is undertaken."

Unless red tapism, which is to the State machine what opium is to the addict, is substituted by speedy discussion on a personal level across the table, the tendency to delay decisions will persist. Weekly meetings of officials should be held for general comparing of notes in a free and mutually appreciative atmosphere. It is gratifying to note that the Organisation and Methods Division of the Union Government, has taken certain steps which would speed up the working of the Secretariat. But, mere reforms in the procedural

part of the secretariat work cannot be enough. The rules of recruitment, promotions and dismissals have to be reorientated, so that the efficient and conscientious public servants are given the recognition, and the slothful and the corrupt are properly dealt with. Emphasising the need for a clean administration, Jefferson once declared: "The whole of Government consists in the art of being honest." Promotion, merely on the basis of seniority, kills all incentive for better and hard work. In this respect, the observations of the Hyderabad Public Service Commission are worth noting. It holds that "no man can be expected to work with efficiency and integrity, if he sees that his efforts lead to nothing, while those with bad records are looked upon with favour." Along with seniority, reputation for character and integrity should be fully taken into consideration. Promotion by selection will shatter the "feudalistic heritage" which hangs heavily on public administration. Selective system will also loosen the rigidity of special services in the secretariat. Too much compartmentalism in services creates jealousy and hampers the growth of unity in public service. In the new socialist order, individualism and rivalry must give place to a feeling of common brotherhood and homogeneous social outlook. Such an atmosphere of sympathy and understanding is essential because society, as Chamfort, the French epigrammatist has said, would be a charming affair if we were only interested in one another.

In the new equalitarian society, social justice is to be provided to one and all. Therefore, the acceptance of a bribe by an official from any person has to be considered as an act of monstrous social injustice. Admittedly, corruption is on the decline owing to the growing social awareness among the services. Still, it is there all the same. To root it out, the Government should establish an independent agency enjoying a statutory status with its own investigation staff to deal with cases of corruption. Such a powerful agency is needed, for in the words of the former British Prime Minister, Mr. Clement Attlee, "the administration of a country should be above reproach, as democracy cannot thrive in an atmosphere of suspicion." At present, corruption cases are dealt with at the departmental level and pressures are often brought to bear upon those who conduct departmental inquiries. Besides, the burden of routine duties is so heavy that officers, in spite of their best wishes, cannot give the necessary time to departmental enquiries. But, the new proposed agency being independent, and its sole purpose being to inquire into cases of corruption, it will be in a position to hold detached investigation into charges, and also do its job speedily. The Government is keen to weed out corruption. Yet, its efforts do not usually succeed due to

OBLIGATIONS OF OFFICE

the dilatory procedure which is adopted to hold investigation. The establishment of a separate high-powered department will eliminate some of the weaknesses from which the Government's efforts for checking corruption have suffered so far.

It is common knowledge that in the rush of work, officers do not find it possible to attend to all the complaints. Therefore, Complaints and Inquiry Offices should be set up at District Headquarters. These offices should receive complaints about all departments, except judicial, and pass them on to the head of the department concerned. The action taken by the Government should be at once intimated to the complainant. Quick and prompt measures to root out corruption will restore the confidence of the people in the administration, and they will, in a still greater degree, extend their co-operation to the various development schemes. In this respect, the Planning Commission maintains that "public co-operation and good will are obtained when there is a belief in the integrity and efficiency of the administration." In view of the fact that the success of democratic planning depends on the extent the people offer their co-operation, the administration should set high standards of moral integrity and stimulate enthusiasm among the people, and bring about their purposeful participation in the socially beneficent schemes. Public co-operation is not just a catchword to be used in a customary manner. It is the phenomenon of generating new spirit and vitality through the conduct of the administrators themselves. The pledge to establish an equalitarian social order has placed a great responsibility on the people, too. The whole world is watching our gigantic social experiment. To make that experiment a success, men of calibre and character are essential. Mr. J.G. Holland the American novelist-poet, has aptly described in the following lines, the type of men that we need to-day:

*God give us men. A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands !
Men whom the lust of office does not kill,
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy,
Men who possess opinions and a will,
Men who love honour, men who cannot lie.*

CHAPTER THIRTY-THREE

MANUFACTURING MISFITS

In education we should have less of the Three R's and more of the Three Graces—grace of speech, grace of movement, grace of manner.

—GEORGE SAMSON

EVERY country evolves its own system of education to meet the particular requirements of the community. Since education must enlighten social needs, in conformity with national genius, we have different systems of education in different countries. The pattern of education gets moulded as to preserve the country's historical traditions and cultural trends. In this way, the continuity of civilization is secured. If an attempt to break away from the historical past is made, the social fabric tends to suffer from the coherence of continuity. Conservation of values that colour cultural heritage appears essential for the orderly progress of a nation. Relevant to this context is the observation of Churchill, in the House of Commons, that if we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future.

It is through the content and method of education, that the State tries to develop the minds of the young ones, in accordance with its social philosophy. For example, in a totalitarian country, the interests of the State, as opposed to that of the individual are glorified, and to achieve that end, individualism is denounced. In truth, educational institutions are used as an instrument for mental regimentation and exalting the entity of the State. While in a democratic country, the State through the medium of education provides maximum scope for the development of individual traits and the all-round growth of human personality. In a democratic society, people are encouraged to think for themselves because, as Walter Bagehot says in *Parliamentary Reform*, "governments are only strong when public opinion is definite and decided." In a theocratic State, religion finds the highest place in the curriculum. The strength of such a State lies in the religious beliefs of its citizens. New ideas and new thought are kept away from schools and colleges, for they shatter conservatism created by scriptural dogmas. If harmony between educational policies and national objectives is not fostered—since education in the words of Dr. Hibben is the ability to meet life's situation—neither can social cohesion be maintained, nor

MANUFACTURING MISFITS

can economic progress be secured. If the State fails to co-ordinate the educational system with its social ideals, it not only creates conditions of dissatisfaction among the youth, but weakens its own foundations. It has rightly been said that "upon the education of the people of a country, the fate of the country depends."

Considering the organic bond between education and political ideology, it is of paramount importance that our system of education should be refashioned to conform to socialistic aspirations. Education must advance the cause of social justice and bring into being a feeling of brotherhood and unity among the rich and the poor, the high and the low. In fact, education in a socialistic society must teach the art of identifying oneself with the most neglected and the backward. Men are no longer considered high, because they possess wealth. It is the service of the poor that will give prestige in the new social system that is being shaped.

Our schools which were founded to meet the needs of a competitive order should be so conducted, as to become living embodiments of new social standards based on mutual trust and social co-operation. This transformation is essential because school houses, as Mr. Horace Mann has put it, "are the republican line of defence." At present our schools and colleges do not even breathe an Indian atmosphere. This only shows how much effort is required to make our educational institutions real centres for the propagation of ideals of social unity and economic equality. Radical change is needed all the more urgently, as independence has not yet inspired any serious movement for educational revolution. We have had various Committees and Commissions, like the Sadler Commission, the Sargent Committee, the Mootham Committee, the Acharya Narendra Dev Committee, the Radhakrishnan Commission and the Secondary Education Commission, which made recommendations towards educational reform. But most of their recommendations remained only wishful. Why were not these recommendations implemented? The Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan gives the answer: "For want of resources, adequate progress has not been made in implementing some of these proposals." These reports dealt mainly with reforms to remove defects in the administrative side of education. And whatever reforms were introduced were of a piece-meal nature, because a clear-cut national policy had not been defined to guide the educationists. In an unplanned manner, sometimes new subjects were introduced, or the curriculum was changed. Such changes had no social purpose behind them. Although, the subject of education has been thrashed out by a host of experts, confusion still continues in the domain of education.

What is needed most is a declaration of broad national policy

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

and unity of direction in implementing it. Though education happens to be a State subject, the country's pledge to establish an equalitarian society, imposes certain obligations on the Centre as well, in evolving the educational pattern on an all-India basis for the sake of bringing about harmony between the system of education and national aims. The Union Government cannot remain a mere spectator to the prevailing confusion in the sphere of education. "The foundation of every State," Diogenes, the Greek philosopher, laid down, "is the education of its youth." The States can have ample opportunities in working out the details of national policy, in accordance with their local conditions and peculiar requirements of the people inhabiting different regions.

II

THE impact of freedom has been felt in all spheres of national activities. Yet, it will be no exaggeration to say that our schools and colleges have remained ignorant of the great peaceful revolution that took place in 1947. This fact is spotlighted by the President, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, when he declares: "While many things in the national sphere in India have changed almost beyond recognition, no basic change has so far taken place in the educational system introduced by the British over 100 years ago." In our educational institutions the students hardly feel that they have now the good fortune of being the citizens of free India. The ghost of Macaulay still seems to stalk our universities. The old type of the educated class, having no other ambition than to join Government service, is still being manufactured. It is a pity that it is only in this country that some kind of sanctity is attached to Government employment. This respectability of Government service may be due to security that Government service offers even though the salary is usually small. So long as Government puts a premium on the possession of a degree as a prerequisite to entering service, the tempo of rush to the universities will remain, and education will continue to be a gamble for soft job employment. The State must devise other ways and means to test the efficiency and capability of individuals for the purposes of recruitment to the services, and only a bare minimum of academic qualification must be fixed. In this respect, the A.I.C.C. at Agra, in July 1953, categorically stated that "admission to public services should depend on special tests and merit and ability, and not merely on the possession of degrees."

The Britishers only wanted "babus" to help them in the administration of the country. They never cared for the development of a balanced social outlook among the students. No

doubt, the system was a success from the British point of view, though the harm it did to national character has been incalculable. The Britishers produced lifeless educational institutions and deficient human products.

Although, after independence the educational policy of the British days was not cast off, a countrywide programme of expanding educational facilities and providing equal opportunities to all boys and girls was undertaken. All discriminations based on religious grounds, or social prejudices, were removed from educational institutions. And to level up the backward classes, special facilities in the form of scholarships and grants were extended to them. Such a policy was essential because the first duty of a State is to remove ignorance from the minds of the people. This duty is so much stressed by Carlyle, that in his book, *Sartor Resartus*, he goes to the extent of calling it a tragedy "if one man dies of ignorance who had capacity for knowledge." The emphasis on expansion was, however, so great that no attention worth the name was paid to improve the tone of education. In fact, expansion was given so much priority that even the old time standards suffered. This was logical because different kinds of schools and colleges were multiplied in a haphazard way. It was little realised that bricks and mortar do not make a school or a college. The enthusiastic administration forgot that it is the content of education and the scholarly qualities of teachers that lend dignity to educational institutions, and give light to the ignorant. In a planned progressive society, the twin objectives of quantity and quality should not be regarded as mutually exclusive; they should be pursued with equal zeal.

Since the qualitative factor in education had been ignored, the mass of young persons did not possess the requisite qualifications to meet the changing needs of free India. Indeed, enlarged numbers have become a danger to democracy itself, as their social thinking has not been moulded in accordance with the new national aims. And yet their desire for employment has grown with their numbers. Finding themselves strangers to employment in their own land—because the type of education they receive has no relationship with life—they have become frustrated, developing an attitude of cynicism and even of perversity. Thus, education instead of generating constructive urges in the young ones to work for social good, has tended to create a gulf fertile with disaffection between the individual and the society. This ammunition for disruptive force, if allowed to pile up, might blow up the social fabric, and all our dreams of an egalitarian society aiming at the welfare of all, might vanish like dreams. So great is the power of education as an instrument of social stability, that in *The Outline of History*, H.G. Wells warned the world

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

that human history was becoming more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

III

THE social significance of education being so vital, we have to overhaul the educational structure so as to produce integrated human beings imbued with the ideals of self-reliance and service. The importance of giving the right type of education to the boys can be well appreciated from the famous remark of the Duke of Wellington which he made while watching a cricket match at Eton, that "the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing-fields of Eton." We must always bear in mind that the worst defect in the present system is that it infuses the spirit of mutual jealousy and selfish competition in the minds of our students. Egoism is developed to such an extent that the educated class feels superior to the ordinary man. With this attitude the young men tend to draw away from the main current of life, and start claiming special privileges, unmindful of the rights of others, or of their own duties. The possession of a degree develops an upper class mentality in them. Thus, education has a tendency to create new kinds of social distinctions, and divide man from man, instead of linking the people together with faith in a common destiny. India already suffers from many disparities which have stood in the way of her progress. The creation of a new privileged class of degree-holders, whose values and attitudes are at a tangent from that of the common man, further complicates the task of freeing the social system from the shackles of snobbish distinctions. The feeling of social equality must be inculcated in the student community, if society is to be cast on socialistic lines. That is why Mr. U. N. Dhebar asserts "that in the new society we must have education that eliminates all class distinctions, education that realises dignity of labour, education that helps the process of co-operation, sacrifice and service."

The spirit of co-operation can never be infused in the students unless their character is developed on right lines. Therefore, our schools and colleges must act, as Lord Morley has said, "great luminaries dispensing knowledge and kindling that ardent love of new truth, for which youth is the irrevocable season." It is character which provides a steering wheel to the nation's mind, and no scheme of national reconstruction can succeed unless the people put more emphasis on their social obligations than on their individual interests.

The home as an environment plays a vital part in developing the personality of a child. The observation of Hosea Ballou, is

MANUFACTURING MISFITS

pregnant with reality: "Education commences at the mother's knee, and every word spoken within the hearsay of little children tends towards the formation of their character." Consciousness, therefore, has to be created among the parents that proper upbringing of a child is more important than the possession of wealth. The children must be properly trained in democratic ways of life, and for that purpose, all trends of authoritarianism should be rooted out from family life. Then alone will our homes become the happy cradles of the prosperous socialist order.

CHAPTER THIRTY-FOUR

LEARNING FOR LIFE

It would be part of my scheme of education, that every youth in the State should learn to do something finely and thoroughly with his hands so as to let him know what touch meant, and what stout craftsmanship meant, and to inform him of many things, besides which no man can learn, but by some severely accurate discipline in doing. Let him once learn to take a straight shaving off a plank, or draw a fine curve, without faltering, or lay a brick level in its mortar, and he has learnt a multitude of other matters, which no lips of man could ever teach him.

—JOHN RUSKIN

SOcialism can only be brought about if every individual makes some contribution to the productive efforts of the nation. Wealth must be produced to remove economic disequilibrium, and for that sustained hard work is needed. Slogans and catch phrases, however attractive and moving, will not usher in the equalitarian social order that we have in mind. Our educational system, therefore, should be such that not only develops the intellectual faculties of the young ones, but can also teach them the art of some productive work. Such an approach is in tune with modern thinking. For instance, Mr. M.J. Jacks, Director of the Oxford University Institute of Education, in his recent publication, entitled *The Education of Good Men*, insists that "all education should aim at inculcating the habit of conscientious and efficient work, which is so lacking to-day." The old pattern of education does not suit the purposes of the new society, for it tends to create rigid compartments with intellectual and manual work divorced from each other. This is due to the fact that the system is too scholastic, academic and bookish, and neither activity nor experience, nor observation, have any place in it. No wonder, our educational institutions have been called, "centres of information and not education." Receptivity is so much emphasised that the child remains a passive recipient during the whole process of education; he accepts what the teacher offers him. Free thinking has no scope in conventional method. The child just passes through the process of teaching. He does not learn, because he is not a participant in what he is taught. Mr. Horace Mann, the American educator, has very appropriately said that "a teacher who is attempting to teach, without inspiring the pupil

with a desire to learn, is hammering on cold iron.

In all modern methods of education, like the Project Method, the Dalton Plan, the Kindergarten System, or the Supervised Study Scheme, the child learns through some kind of self-effort. These systems are the latest educational inventions. They are mainly based on Plato's wisdom, as he laid down in his *Republic*: "Let early education be a sort of amusement; you will then be better able to find out the natural bent." In the progressive methods of education "the school is taken to be meant for the child and not the child for the school." This attitude enables the teacher to discover the latent aptitudes of the child, and consequently, give him the kind of attention he requires to develop his faculties. Modern methods of education give to the student what he particularly needs, and take from him according to his individual capacity. This human angle in education gives the teacher full opportunity to discharge his duty, as "the most, useful type of a successful teacher," Sir Walter Raleigh affirms, "is one whose main interest is the children, not the subject."

II

THE basic system of education possesses dynamism and is best suited for a socialist economy, because the child learns by doing, and as a result of that, the head, heart and hand, develop in a systematic and harmonious manner. He also earns a little while he learns, and this engenders a spirit of self-reliance. The child, therefore, starts feeling that he is being socially useful. Since in the basic system, experience takes the place of theoretical instruction, dignity of labour is instilled in the minds of the young ones, replacing the artificial division between intellectual and manual work. All the students work together on equal terms, and the prejudices of social distinctions disappear.

The vocational bias in the basic system gives practical training in productive work, and thereby enables the young to participate in various nation-building activities. It is wrong to say that the practical bias hampers the development of mental faculties. Modern educational psychologists have recognised that "mental muscles can only be developed through self-exertion and self-activity." In fact, Mr. B.T. Washington, in his book *Up From Slavery*, maintains that "no race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem." The basic method not only develops the mind and body of the youth by co-ordinating manual activity with mental purposes, and makes him socially conscious, but also helps in integrating the educational system with economic planning.

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

The value of the basic system becomes all the more important because a decentralised method of production, through small-scale industries, has now been accepted as an essential part of socialist economics. The countrywide net-work of small and medium industries will provide ample scope for employment to students who have learnt some craft in basic schools. Therefore, the basic method, which takes into account the practical utility of education, must be implemented with sincerity, and our schools and colleges, "instead of remaining the centres of bookish learning must become real bee-hives of productive activity." In this connection, the words of Mr. U.N. Dhebar should carry weight. "It is inconceivable," the Congress President declares, "that a nation can afford to waste even a small part of her national energy on a system of education, fit only for the social order that she is determined to change."

Although, the Government of India and the Planning Commission, have accepted the Wardha Scheme as the future pattern of education, not much progress has been made to popularise it. Most of our educationists consider the scheme as a fad. They place little reliance on its efficiency. Of course, they do not reject it in an outright manner, as they are afraid to do so. All the same, they do not accept it. They feel that the old system was good, for it had produced great persons. "But that should not be an argument," says Nehru, "against the new system." This vacillating attitude on the part of those in charge of education has done a lot of harm to the cause of basic education because, instead of taking definite shape the system has just drifted along, according to the predilections of the officers in charge of education. Realising this state of confusion—bordering on educational anarchy—the Congress, at its Avadi Session, called upon the State Governments to introduce basic education within a period of ten years.

III

SOME persons feel that the aim of basic education is merely to produce skilled craftsmen. To entertain such a feeling is to do gross injustice to this revolutionary plan. Crafts are not taught in a mechanical manner as is done in ordinary workshops. Academic subjects are taught through the medium of craft, and this process not only makes the learning of these subjects easier and more interesting, but enables the student to learn some socially useful work as well.

The Standing Committee on Basic Education has pointed out, that "the emphasis on productive work and crafts in basic

schools should not be taken to mean that the study of books can be ignored. The value of the book, both as a source of additional systematised knowledge and of pleasure cannot be denied, and a good library is as essential in a basic school as in any other type of good schools." This emphasis on studying books is logical, because in the words of Voltaire, "all the known world, excepting only savage nations, is governed by books." As the teaching of traditional subjects, through productive activities, helps in the development of every aspect of human personality, the social purpose of education is amply realised. Rightly it has been said that "basic education is essentially an education for life, and what is more, an education through life."

It may also be carefully noted, that craft alone, is not the centre of co-relation, as it was when the basic scheme was first envisaged in 1935. The First Basic Education Conference held at Poona, in 1939, added two more subjects, namely, social and physical environment. This widened the scope and purpose of the original Wardha Scheme and the subjects related to the three centres of co-relation, that is to say craft work, social and physical environment, began to be taught. This has been done because basic education, according to the Union Home Minister, Mr. G.B. Pant, "aims at turning schools into community centres through which the social and material interests of the community are advanced in a well thought-out manner."

If basic education is to play an effective role in building anew the old and static Indian economy, the selection of crafts must be judicious and in accordance with the needs and requirements of a particular region. Such discreet policy will help in raising the economic standards of that area. Basic education is deprecated by urban people, as there is too much emphasis on spinning and weaving. They will readily accept it, if crafts involving technical skills, are employed to impart education. In the rural areas also, the scope in the choice of crafts must be widened, so as to enable young persons to acquire some technological knowledge for improving the efficiency and productivity of village industries.

It is of utmost importance that the system of education should be of uniform character throughout India. At present, the pattern of education in the rural and urban sectors, is vastly different. Due to this divergence, the rural people harbour a grievance, and feel that they are being condemned to "an inferior type of education." Such a feeling stands in the way of creating a common social purpose. "India lives in her villages, not in her cities," said Gandhiji. And we can ill afford to have a countryside suffering from a sense of inferiority.

One of the reasons for not converting the traditional schools

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

into basic ones is, that the cost of education in basic schools is much more than in ordinary schools, as the setting up of workshops involves high expenditure. Considering the limited fiscal resources of the country, the argument sounds plausible. The only way out is to make use of the crafts that already exist, both in villages and towns. The decision taken by the Government to utilise fully the schemes of the Community Projects, the National Extension Services, the All-India Khadi and Village Industries Board and the Small-Scale Industries Board, for imparting education to the children studying in basic schools through productive activities, would considerably save primary expense on equipment and workshops. Such a scheme, if properly extended, will not only spread the basic system in every corner of India, but will also increase appreciably the number of crafts as centres of co-relation. It need not be emphasised that this enlargement in the variety of crafts will widen the scope of basic education, and impart new significance to the system itself.

IV

IT should be borne in mind, however, that merely turning primary schools into basic ones, will not be enough. Unless secondary schools are also run on the basic pattern, education will not truly help in the achievement of national objectives. It is a pity that the Secondary Education Commission avoided suggesting ways and means for popularising basic education in secondary schools. The authors merely say that their scheme does not interfere with the Wardha Scheme. The Commission would have done a great service to the cause of education, if it had come out with a scheme to universalise basic education. Of course, its recommendations that secondary education should not be merely considered as the stepping stone to university education, and that a student after the secondary stage "should be in a position, if he wishes to enter on the responsibilities of life and take up some useful vocation," and that multi-purpose schools should be opened with a view to providing diversification of courses to enable a student "to use and develop his natural aptitude and inclinations in the special course of studies chosen by him," are indeed commendable. Such a viewpoint has the support of modern social thinkers. As a matter of fact, T.H. Huxley, in *Technical Education*, expresses the view that the great end of life is not knowledge but action.

The Government on its part, in order to encourage the introduction of the basic method, should give preference in recruiting for services to students with basic training. Needless to say, such students because of their special vocational background,

will be very useful to the various development schemes which are spreading the message of welfare economics to the vast rural sector. It is rather unfortunate, as admitted by the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan, that lack of adequate and qualified personnel has been one of the major handicaps in the implementation of programmes in the First Plan. This shows the urgent necessity of opening multi-purpose schools and polytechnic institutions. We shall only be able to produce skilled technicians and qualified hands, if the basic system at the primary, secondary and university level is adopted wholeheartedly. In the new socialist pattern, a poised occupational balance between agriculture and industry, must be achieved for making the economic system cohesive. This balance can only be effected, if persons are given technical training and diverted from the rural to the industrial sector.

CHAPTER THIRTY-FIVE

DEMOCRACY DEMANDS DISCIPLINE

Flaming youth has become a flaming question. And youth comes to us wanting to know what we may propose to do about a society that hurts so many of them.

—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

OUR students played a notable part in the struggle for Indian independence. The sacrifices they made are worthy to be written in letters of gold in the History of Indian Freedom Movement. To-day when India is trying to construct the edifice of her socio-economic system, students must develop a crusading spirit and participate in the high adventure. By their energy and resourcefulness, they can accelerate the various development schemes which are being started in their home regions. If the students spend their free hours in nation-building projects, they would impart new significance to the concept of democratic planning. Their willing co-operation, besides being a great social asset, will also help them in developing their own personality through living upto, what Socrates preached: "A man should inure himself to voluntary labour, and not give in to indulgence and pleasure, as they beget no good constitution of body, nor knowledge of mind." The example of the student community would influence the minds of grown up, but less knowing people, and a new atmosphere of service and sacrifice would be created. The University Education Commission recognised the good work done by a section of the students in this direction. The Report says: "We are proud of the generous and unselfish activities which our young men and women are making to lift the standards of life in the villages."

Freedom has put a tremendous responsibility on our students, and the nation expects great things from them. This social duty, they will only be able to discharge, if they have a trained mind and disciplined body. But, it is most unfortunate that a wave of indiscipline, sometimes culminating in disorder and rowdyism, has swept through a large number of schools and colleges. This state of affairs tends to disrupt social solidarity which is so essential for the orderly progress of the nation towards the socialist goal.

II

THE principal cause of the growth of indiscipline in the student

DEMOCRACY DEMANDS DISCIPLINE

community is the system of education, which being outmoded, has not the vitality to meet the challenge of our times. Education seems to have no social significance for our educationists. The social angle of education—a force that could shape the character of the students for the new ways of life—has not been taken up seriously. What makes matters still worse is that even the individualistic angle of education, which aims at developing the inherent qualities, has been ignored. Proper education, pedagogically speaking, means harmonising the social and individual aspects of education. In this context, Nehru's remark that "it is becoming increasingly doubtful how far this present system is education at all in any true sense of the word," can be fully appreciated.

Let alone imparting the right type of education, even discipline is not explained to students in its true perspective. It is supposed by the teachers to be an abstract thing, a kind of negative virtue, in the sense, that there should be no noise in the class room. This concept of discipline could meet the purposes of a feudalistic pattern of society. But with the acceptance of new social values, the connotation of discipline must have a new meaning. In modern educational philosophy, discipline does not merely mean a quiet class room. Even in a class room, initiative and activity are encouraged to sharpen creative faculties. Of course, from a broader social point, righteous conduct in every aspect of human activity means discipline. If a man claims rights which he denies to others, it shows that his mind is not disciplined, and that he believes in social distinctions. Such an attitude is considered anti-social because democracy, as Jefferson has said, "stands for equal rights for all and special privileges for none." In this context, too, discipline must be interpreted as the performance of social obligations, and conversely, indiscipline as insistence on particular privileges.

At present, education is in a state of confusion, as there is hardly any awareness of social ideals among most educationists. And confusion provides the finest breeding ground for the germs of indiscipline. Our educators must realise that new ideas and new aspirations are influencing the minds of the young. They no longer feel satisfied with merely passing an examination, for that does not mean much in the present day Indian conditions. Public examinations are no real test of a student's intelligence and capacity for hard work; in a few hours, the whole year's work cannot be assessed. They are more in the nature of a lottery. The students want that type of education which will qualify them for productive and nationally useful work. In its absence, they become sullen and frustrated, and start believing that society is not giving them a just deal because after spending thousands of rupees on education, the chances of their getting employment remain remote. It is an

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

admitted fact, that uncertainty with regard to their future makes them nervous, and the prospect of misery frightens them. Consequently, their indiscipline becomes a protest against society in which they feel they have no place. And what is more disturbing is that according to prevalent notions, society does not expect a degree holder to do any other job except office work. Manual work generally enjoys no respect. Discussing the social concept of manual labour, Ulysses S. Grant, the former U.S. President, rightly observed that "labour disgraces no man; unfortunately you occasionally find men disgrace labour." Time, therefore, is ripe for an equable social climate in which dignity of the shovel is on par with dignity of the chair. This change in values will give the right directive to education.

Educational institutions being of a conservative character, hardly give to the students any satisfaction, and they become restless. The abundance of vitality with which youth is associated does not find any medium for expression in sober and listless class rooms. Cramming of text books hardly affords opportunities to the spirit of youth, which Ruskin maintains, "needs several sorts of food of which knowledge is only one." Nor extra time and surplus energy are channelised for any purposeful activity. Idle gossip becomes their forced past time. Since a mind quite vacant, as Cowper says, is a mind distressed, students to-day are at a loose end. It is wrong to say that they have become professional agitators. Their heart is sound and they are amenable to reason. Only their idealism, without opportunity, makes them impatient. They do not feel at home with the worn out social system. This feeling is only symbolic of the universal desire for a happier life. In *The Greek View of Life*, Prof. G.L. Dickinson tells us that "dissatisfaction with the world in which we live, and determination to realise one that shall be better, are the prevailing characteristics of the modern spirit." Most of the men in charge of education are still moving in old grooves, and their way of thinking has not changed. They fail to appreciate the new values that are shaping thoughts of the student community. This lack of appreciation creates a tense atmosphere. The dynamism of our times demands that the old generation, instead of always complaining against the youth for their unconventional behaviour, should try to understand the new urges of the new generation. Aptly has Vinobaji said: "There is no indiscipline in the students. Only a new music has caught them. If you strike the new symphony and play the right chord, they will simply dance at your behest." A generous understanding of the new forces will help in the creation of a constructive outlook among the students, and they will play their rightful role in the peaceful social revolution that is going on in the country.

III

THE students, on their part, must develop a consciousness that harmonious relationship can only be brought about, if they give up thinking in terms of "free school" and "absolute freedom," and show respect to the authorities and consider them as their benefactors and guides. They should think more of their duties and obligations to the institution to which they belong, and less of their rights and privileges. To be precise, they should keep on performing their duties unmindful of their rights, and remember the dictum of the distinguished novelist, George Eliot, that "the reward of one duty is the power to fulfil another." It is derogatory for them to be dubbed as chronic grumblers and habitual fault finders.

It is rather unfortunate that trade union mentality has come to stay among the students and generally an atmosphere of industrial conflict prevails in the universities. Committees of action are formed to organise strikes. And, if this strategy fails, educational institutions are picketed and fasts undertaken to coerce the authorities into submission. Even law suits are filed against the institutions. Such methods are understandable in industry, where capitalists exploit workers, and strike is the only weapon to secure collective bargaining. Even in that sector conflicts are to be avoided because the new social order derives its strength from the good will of every section of society. But educational institutions are not run to make profits by exploiting students. The expenditure on education, in fact, is much higher than the fees paid by students. There exist "teaching shops" run privately in some big cities, no doubt, which have a rather commercial outlook, and these have to be checked. Yet, so far as student's action goes, what is still more disquieting is, that "mass action" is resorted to on the flimsiest grounds for stressing small demands. Since educational institutions in general are for their benefit, any mass level action on the part of students is never worthy of academic tradition.

This disease of trade unionism infecting the student body can only be cured if the true purpose of students' unions is properly understood. Students' unions should not function as rival camps. Nor should they exercise their power to protect student interests alone. Their real object is to supplement academic studies by providing opportunities for extra curricular activities. It will help in the achievement of the real aims of students' unions, if they do not have written or formal constitutions. The rights and privileges of students' unions are best established by conventions. Any rigidity, followed in this direction, makes the students feel that these unions are a parallel authority to the governing body of an educational institution and, thereby, competent to wield control over the

affairs of that institution. Such an attitude tends to break the spiritual bond between the educators and the "educand." The colleges, instead of being what Disraeli once described as "places of light, of liberty and of learning," become centres of power politics. Students' unions, if they are to play a constructive role, must accept the over-all supervision and control of the parent institution and give all assistance in its smooth functioning as a seat of learning. The students should not forget the saying of Emerson, whose essays they read so fondly, that "obedience alone gives the right to command." If students have any grievances, they should place them before the authorities in a constitutional manner. It is equally important that their grievances, usually called demands, should be sympathetically considered, and the reasonable ones redressed without bargaining. And, indeed, in consonance with the new democratic spirit, it will do no harm, if the management took the students into confidence, whenever changes in academic life are planned. Authoritarian methods of imposing things irritate the sensitive mind of the youth. If the heads of educational institutions deal with students in a human manner, a co-operative atmosphere would prevail. Lord Brougham was just right when he said : "Education makes people easy to lead, but difficult to drive ; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave."

The students, in no case, should look to leaders of political parties to help them "fight for their rights." And the political parties must keep their hands off the student community. By making students dabble in party politics, the politicians are doing incalculable harm to the cause of education. Indeed, all the political parties in India ought to set up a convention of not even enrolling students as their primary members.

IV

IT is most deplorable that sometimes even teachers are guilty of instigating students to commit acts of indiscipline. The reason for this extraordinary attitude is that the teachers themselves are engrossed in the sombre game of educational politics. The teaching staff encourages agitation, as it is dissatisfied with the low pay or service conditions. But whatever may be the magnitude of dissatisfaction, teachers have little business to exploit the youth for their own selfish ends. The teachers by indulging in such unprofessional conduct, betray the trust reposed in them, by both the parents and the nation.

Teachers none would deny must be paid well, and also their service conditions improved respectably. The State and society both must do their duty by the teachers. It is obvious that unless

DEMOCRACY DEMANDS DISCIPLINE

their salaries are increased, their social status and prestige will remain low. The noble profession of being *gurus* since ancient times will regain its nobility, if teachers are not treated with negligence and scant respect. In this regard, the Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan has categorically laid down that "the provision of satisfactory salaries for teachers should be accepted as a measure essential for the effective reorganisation of the system of education. In general, it would be agreed that teachers' salaries should be fixed at levels, consistent with the local pay structure at which suitably qualified persons could be attracted and retained in the profession." At present, because of starvation wages, the profession is being denuded of talent. It seems that the sarcasm of Oscar Wilde that "everybody who is incapable of learning has taken to teaching," has some validity in the context of the prevalent conditions in the profession. To improve the social standards of teachers, the recommendation of the Secondary Education Commission should be implemented by all the States, which calls for the appointment of "special committees to review the scales of pay of teachers of all grades, and to make suggestions that meet in a fair and just manner the present cost of living."

Public opinion is consciously sympathetic towards the human cause of teachers and realises that in laying the foundations of a progressive society, it is essential to have well-paid and talented teachers. But, if they try to use students as ready tools for their personal motives, the public would condemn them as traitors to the country, sabotaging the development of the future builders of the nation. The influence of a teacher on the life of a student is tremendous. In fact, the noted English author, Mr. Henry Adams, emphatically maintains that "a teacher effects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops." Therefore, teachers should fully engage themselves in imparting real knowledge to students and placing before them the true values of life, so that they become trained and disciplined citizens.

It is imperative that in the new social context, teachers should approach the question of education from a different angle. Merely asking the pupils to concentrate on what is written in books will not meet the requirements of the proposed socialistic society. Love for service must be inculcated among students, and this can only be done, if teachers themselves become a living embodiment of social morality. Teachers will find no difficulty in serving the great cause of education if they remember the wisdom of Ruskin that "education does not mean teaching people what they do not know. It is a painful, continual and difficult work to be done by kindness, by watching, by warning, by precept, and by praise, but above all—by example."

CHAPTER THIRTY-SIX

INNER INTEGRATION

Moral duty consists in the observance of those rules of conduct which contribute to the welfare of society, and by implication of individuals who compose it. The end of society is peace and mutual protection, so that the individual may reach the fullest and highest life attainable by man. The rules of conduct by which this end is to be attained are discoverable—like the other so-called laws of Nature—by observation and experiment, and only in that way.

—T.H. HUXLEY

IT is not an easy task to refashion a society in which gross individualism and narrow sectionalism are rampant, into a new one which guarantees social and economic equality. United effort in all directions is needed to reach the cherished socialist goal. But without real emotional integration among the people, as Nehru calls it, concerted social action is not possible. Therefore, a homogeneous national outlook is the *sine qua non* of the socialist pattern we wish to establish in India. Those who underestimate the value of national cohesion should ponder over the words of Longfellow. He said :

*All your strength is in your union
All your danger is in discord.*

If we turn over the pages of our history, we find that kingdoms fell, empires collapsed and ruling dynasties broke down, for disunity had crept into the lives of the people. Our dissensions, quarrels and jealousies enabled the Britishers to entrench themselves in India. The Britishers had an easy walk over because, as is said in the *New Testament*, "if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand." In the days of freedom, the first thing that the Congress did was to create a new sense of nationhood in the country. It is with this consciousness of the unity of the people that we fought the alien rulers. To-day the political unification of India is complete and the country has a well-knit, strong and stable administration. Yet, that is not enough. Integration of India, territorially will not have that supreme vitality and significance, unless there comes about a corresponding integration of the minds of men. The realisation of this political unity, although a great achievement in itself—since we have never been a united nation in the true sense in the days gone by—should not make us self-complacent to fissi-

parous urges. All manner of disruptive tendencies are at work, which tend to destroy the integrity of India, by creating mental barriers affecting our new social scheme. It is possible that persons who lend support to these viviseptive forces, may not be conscious of their dangerous consequences. It is this rigid social compartmentalism seeking to divide man from man that hampers the growth of homogeneous thought. Unless such tendencies are fought with determination, not only will the country's progress towards the goal of social equality be impeded, but even our freedom will be in danger. Of course, the glorious work which the Congress has done so far in uplifting the masses of the people will be undone. We must stop distrusting each other, whatever be our social status, or mode of living, and develop oneness of heart and purpose, if we wish to build up a classless society. "Hating people," Fosdick once said, "is like burning our own house to get rid of a rat."

With the nation's pledge to establish the socialistic pattern, our social values have undergone a substantial change. At least, the process of harmonising ways and thought with the needs and requirements of a progressive society has started. But the social structure, which has been handed down to us since times immemorial, bears little relation to our new social urges. If we do not shut our eyes to the realities of some of our reactionary beliefs of high and low, and primitive customs of sect superiority, we have to admit that our social system has to be thoroughly recast and co-ordinated with new beliefs, founded on the dignity of man. Let us remember that economic inequalities will persist, unless social distinctions are rooted out from our minds. In fact, social equality will provide dynamism to the new socialist order, which aims at developing every aspect of human personality.

The evils of untouchability, casteism and communalism, by creating social and religious barriers, weaken the nation, as they have done in the past. Therefore, an all-out united effort must be made to eradicate them from the soil of India. In this great social task, we should never forget the words of Thoreau that "there is never an instant's truce between virtue and vice." The disruptive tendencies of triple evil must be fought against, because the unity of man is a symbol of the new equalitarian society. It is wrong to presume that reactionary beliefs will die their natural death in the new progressive environment. Relevant to this context, is the observation of Mr. Hewlett Johnson, in his book, *The Soviet Power*, that "not so easily does a people liberate itself from its social past. Many ideas, customs, intolerances and tolerances too, cling on unperceived by those who think that they live in days where all things are new."

II

TO brand a man as socially inferior on account of his birth, and then to exploit him because of this imposed inferiority, is a monstrous absurdity. Such a base proposition constitutes a challenge to democracy itself, as before democracy all men are equal. A person born in the lowliest family should have the fullest opportunity to attain the highest position by dint of hard work. That is why modern society recognises merit and not birth. Since the institution of untouchability creates rigid barriers in the way of social uplift and economic progress of persons born in certain families, its practice has been condemned by all progressive people. It breeds intolerance, encourages sectionalism and creates break-away tendencies. Our Constitution, by Article 17, has abolished untouchability, and laws have been enacted making the practice of untouchability a punishable offence. The adoption of these highly important social Acts was a moral obligation because in the words of Leonardo Da Vinci, "he who does not punish evil, commends it to be done." But mere legislation is not enough for removing untouchability, inasmuch as untouchability like stupidity, cannot be really removed by the coercive powers of the State. Gibbons, the American abolitionist, was right when he held that "reform must come from within, not from without. You cannot legislate for virtue." Of course, legislation curbs the aggressive tendencies of the social evil and checks its ugly manifestations. Still, this evil has stained our social fabric so badly that tremendous efforts, at public level, shall have to be made to cleanse it, if the humanitarian-democratic society is to be built on stable foundations. The problem of untouchability should not be merely viewed in the context of social ethics because the economic condition of *Harijans*, particularly in the villages, is pitiable. Immediate steps should be taken to raise their economic status. This, in turn, will help in removing the barriers of social inequality. Let us hear what the Planning Commission has to say on the question of extirpating untouchability. The Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan observes that "the problems of scheduled castes are an integral part of the general social and economic situation of the country, especially in the rural areas. Their social disabilities are in the process of disappearance, but obviously there is need for providing much larger opportunities for work."

Eradicating untouchability is difficult, as the mass of the people branded as untouchables, provide a ready base for economic exploitation by the superior classes. Our social strategists just did not divide society into different classes, but in a very subtle manner, graded one above the other. The ingenuity of this system enabled every class to secure the services of the class below it, and the un-

touchables, who were the lowest rung of the social ladder, provided the common target for economic and political exploitation. Social distinctions were created to enable three parts of the society to prosper at the cost of the fourth part. The higher classes have continuously exploited "the low born" persons. Still, they have suffered privations in silence. In this connection, the sentiments expressed by Mr. G.B. Pant in the Lok Sabha, while piloting the Untouchability (Offences) Bill, are worth noting. The Home Minister said: "For hundreds of years, members of the Scheduled Castes were subjected to insufferable hardships, indignity and insults, and yet they bore them with patience, but never threatened to change their religion, even at the instance of the ruling communities. They stuck to their own religion, in spite of the handicaps they suffered in many ways, and in spite of temptations and blandishments that were held out by those who ruled in those days. That was their capacity to suffer and loyalty to their faith."

The institution of untouchability has been defended on the ground that it is an indispensable part of the *Varnashram Dharma*. "But to find justification in the out-caste," as H.G. Wells has said, "is to condemn the law." It is argued that if this institution is broken, the social system based on the four *Varnas*, which was created by our sages and has the sanctity of time, would be destroyed. This, it is contended, will be an act of high sacrilege. The protagonists of *Varnashram* conveniently forget that their interpretation of this institution is totally different from the one given by its original authors. The four *Varnas* were created according to the merits and actions of the individuals. This is clear from the sermon of Lord Krishna in the *Bhagvad Gita* that he created the four-fold *Varna* and made it to vary with the merits and functions. Further, Manu, the Hindu law giver, held the view that all men, though equal as the *Sudras* at birth, ascend the scale of *Varna* by dint of acquired merits. Various other scriptures like the *Puranas* can be quoted to prove that the system of four-tier *Varna* was flexible and liable to variations. Yet, the arrogant priestly class, to suit its own selfish purpose, twisted the original texts, and introduced rigidity in the four *Varnas* to perpetuate inequalities. It was also propagated that rigid compartmentalism would make the base of social organism strong. The belief that social divisions were essential for a country's solidarity was not peculiar to India alone. Such a viewpoint, in varying degrees, prevailed in the early days of human civilization. Toynbee, after his long research in the historical processes, has come to the conclusion that the stability of medieval society depended on the fixity of all its parts, as that of modern society is founded on their mobility.

Gandhiji believed in *Varnashram*, but his abhorrence of the practice of untouchability was so intense that he integrated the

question of its removal with the overall question of Indian independence. With the declaration to establish a socialist society, the removal of social distinctions has become all the more imperative. We should, therefore, look at the abolition of untouchability as an indispensable part of the national programme to reconstruct the present social order on egalitarian lines. Unless the problem of untouchability is raised to that priority level, the urgency for its removal from the dark corners of our land and minds, is not likely to be realised. There is no such thing as tolerance towards anything which is a patent evil. That is why in *Modern Painters*, Ruskin maintains: "Things justly disliked, and ascertained to be so, ought to be disliked more and more, until we put an end to them; we have always to beware of getting used to evil, no less than of forgetting good."

III

ANCIENT Indian scriptures do not make any mention of the caste system. But the rigid mould that our pundits gave to the four *Varnas*, resulted in a further division of the social hierarchy into hundreds of high and low castes. No moral or material effort was needed to raise one's social status. A section just grouped itself into a particular caste to establish its special entity. As this process went on, a systematised gradation of castes came into being. This was expected, because sect superiority had become so much of a fashion, that belief in it, shaped the concept of social ethics. Since the social framework came to be divided into numerous small compartments, artificial bars made society static and stunted the growth of common fellow feeling. This social fragmentation, not only negated the democratic ideals of equality, but robbed Hindu society of its collective creative forces, and thereby set in motion the process of degeneration. Social decadence is inevitable when certain sections of society are kept at a lower level. The reason for this degeneration is provided by Emerson when he says: "If you put a chain around the neck of a slave, the other end fastens itself around your own."

Sectional allegiance was encouraged to such an extent that inter-caste marriages and intre-caste dinners led to the ex-communication of the persons concerned. This anti-social practice of ex-communication still continues in many backward areas. Needless to say, sectarian loyalties stand in the way of single-pointed loyalty to India. Dangerous and persecutive evils of the caste system are comprehensive in character. "At the individual level," Mr. U.N. Dhebar tells us, "it breeds arrogance, at the social level rivalry, and at the national level divisions." Casteism, therefore, is the

greatest enemy of national unity. In fact, the concept of caste negatives the very existence of a community. It is a truism that unless the evil is removed in a radical and firm manner from our social structure, democracy will find it difficult to take roots in the minds of the people. Democracy can never thrive on narrow divisions and special privileges, born out of caste distinctions. And it is of utmost importance that social democracy must keep pace with political democracy. Without that, the socialist ideal will remain a distant dream.

The concept of democracy is enlarging with the passage of time. Freedom of expression is certainly the breath of democracy. Still, individual opinion must harmonise itself with progressive social thought. Every act, in order to prove significant, should promote social interests. This is the age of reason and not sentiments, of rationalism and not emotions, of enlightenment and not inhibitions. It is for this very reason that in *Friendship's Garland*, Matthew Arnold says that "the idea at the bottom of democracy is not the doctrine that being able to do what one likes, and say what one likes, is sufficient for salvation, but the victory of reason and intelligence over blind custom and prejudice."

It is rather unfortunate that while democracy tends to equalise social distinctions and remove political inequalities, elections held in India on the basis of adult franchise, in a certain measure, have encouraged sectarianism, as votes sometimes are cast on the basis of caste loyalties. Although, this defect in the system of modern elections has been detected, yet the overall good that democratic elections have done to India is immeasurable. But, all the same, we have to be vigilant in not allowing the flames of casteism to be fanned at the time of elections. To give up the system of elections, because of certain defects, will be to bid good bye to democracy. And, in the larger interests of India, democracy must succeed. If we discard our Constitution, numerous bigger defects will crop up in the political life of the country.

Undoubtedly, we condemn casteism and all its attendant evils. Nevertheless, we are guilty of tolerating it, if not of encouraging it, in almost every sphere of our lives. The practice of using surnames is nothing but a recognition of the caste system. In marriages, caste is still a vital factor. Educational institutions belonging to different castes and communities, still flourish even in advanced cities. If one lodges a suit, the caste of the parties has to be stated in the documents. When a man appears as a witness, he has to declare his caste. In court decrees and judgments, presiding officers have to mention the castes of the parties concerned. When boys and girls apply for admission to a school or college, in the prescribed form they have to state their caste. In the children's books, references in an encouraging manner, are made to the caste

system. We often read of a pious brahmin, a calculating bania, a stubborn jat, a meek chamar, a valiant rajput, a shrewd kaisth, a happy-go-lucky mirasi etc.

What is all the more disquieting is that rules of the Government require candidates to declare their castes in the official forms. But, for the time being, this practice shall have to be continued, because the Government must know the applicant's caste to implement the constitutional guarantees given to Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes, in matters of recruitment to services. Needless to say, if the recognition of caste distinctions from official forms is withdrawn, it would adversely affect the interests of the people belonging to Scheduled Castes and Backward Classes. Since the number of such people, who are socially, economically and educationally backward is very large, Government patronage in their recruitment to services must continue. For long the *Harijans* have been the victims of all manner of inhumanities. Their absorption in the services will go a long way in safeguarding the interests of neglected communities. The necessity of giving special representation to backward people is recognised all over the world. The best guarantee of justice in public dealings, Lord Morley informs us, is the participation in their own Government of the people most likely to suffer from injustice.

Persons belonging to backward communities should not take it for granted that favours in matters of recruitment to services will continue for ever. The main purpose of this liberal policy is to uplift their social status. Therefore, as soon as their status has been raised to a reasonable social level, the caste column in official forms must be struck off. But that will take many years. In the meantime, the practice of stating caste in court documents should be done away with. Schools and colleges should not permit students to mention their caste in the applications invited for admission. Government must withdraw its recognition from denominational institutions. It should also issue instructions that no reference of any kind should be made of the different castes in text books. Revenue authorities must give up the practice of mentioning caste in revenue records. These steps will help in the elimination of the ideas of high and low which the pride and privilege of caste encourage.

IV

AS communalism—another bane of our social polity—creates divisions between different communities, it sabotages national unity and weakens the country. Until all the communities in India shed their religious prejudices against each other, and work unitedly,

it will not be possible to build up the new socialistic order. To bring about that common social outlook, everyone has been given equal rights, irrespective of the religion to which one belongs. The State, as such, lends no particular recognition to any religion. On the other hand, it gives freedom to all religions, and even to those who have no religion, or call themselves atheists. Of course, this freedom is not to be used as a licence to encroach upon the beliefs of others, or interfere with the basic principles of our Constitution. The extent of freedom given to religions can be gauged from the fact that even freedom to proselytise is recognised. But, if coercion is employed in the process to convert others, the State which otherwise keeps aloof intervenes, for then it becomes a law and order problem.

Since all religions have been guaranteed a place of honour in our secular State, their followers should have a sense of security and regard themselves as integral parts of the nation. The secular character of the State should not be interpreted to mean that it wants people to be non-religious. Religion is neither encouraged nor it is a taboo. The State, in order to keep its secular character and to strengthen the confidence of belonging among minority communities, has taken special care to give adequate representation to them in the political, administrative, judicial and diplomatic life of the country. If we count the high positions given to members of minorities, we shall find that our Government has been more than generous in safeguarding the interests of small communities. This step is in keeping with modern political philosophy because governments, according to the noted American reformer, Wendell Phillips, exist "to protect the rights of minorities. The loved and the rich need no protection—they have many friends and few enemies." The Hindus are the majority population of the country. Yet, the State does not encourage the political dominance of the Hindu community over other communities on the basis of religion, for that would mean the negation of the democratic ideal of equality. Moreover, if the majority is allowed to organise itself on the basis of religion, not only will nationalism be strangled, but conditions for religious wars will be created. As it is, crimes of the most heinous nature have been committed in the name of religion. The pages of history bear the blood stains of religious feuds. No wonder, Victor Hugo had gone to the extreme length of declaring that he was for "religion against religions." In the main, Hindus have shown a great deal of tolerance in the past. To-day, when India is laying the foundations of a just and equitable social order, Hindus must give a greater proof of their traditional tolerance and broad outlook. It is socially essential that the Hindu communal organisations must give up their reactionary talk of Hindu Rashtra. The very concept of Hindu Rashtra

cuts at the roots of egalitarianism. Minority communities should also remember that if they continue functioning on religious lines, they will have no chance at all, in the present system of adult franchise, to secure a dominant position in the country's political life. They will not only harm themselves but retard the nation's progress towards the goal of a socialistic society.

From whatever aspect one may examine it, the majority and minority communities have to shed their communal character and work together for the welfare of all. If the different communities pull in opposite directions, they will develop an anti-social outlook, and all hopes of ameliorating the living conditions of the masses will be lost. The Hindus, as the majority community, should inspire confidence among minorities by looking after their social well-being. Secularism, the Hindus should bear in mind, implies more than political equality and religious justice; it has a social significance also. To give a positive proof of their faith in secularism, Hindus must show spontaneous tolerance towards the ways of life of other communities, as nothing disturbs the people more than an attempt to remould their social pattern in accordance with the likes and dislikes of others. For example, when some Hindus talked of bringing about changes in Muslim law of marriage and of inheritance, on the lines of reforms for the Hindus, the Muslims felt perturbed. In our socialistic society, disparities are to be removed from the social, religious, economic and political fields, and national unity fostered. Yet, that does not mean that the social behaviour of all communities must conform to a set pattern. The apt observation of Masaryak, made in his lecture on *The Problem of Small Nations in the European Crisis* that "it is true, and history confirms it, that mankind strives for unity, but it does not strive for uniformity," should be remembered by those Hindus who want the minorities to adopt their particular way of life. The vitality of India lies in her diversity. Therefore, any attempt to create uniformity in the social life of different communities, will tend to weaken the nation.

Minorities on their part should not think in terms of any statutory safeguards, or governmental guarantees. The good will of Hindus is the only real assurance for their welfare. Without any mental reservation, they should trust the majority community. The climate of reciprocal trust and mutual faith is the best guarantor for the ideal of human unity to grow to its full stature. Everyone, to whatever religion, faith or creed he belongs, must regard himself Indian first and anything else afterwards. The dignity of man is much more important than the religion to which one avows faith. Indeed, people have started thinking that social religion is much more useful than individual religion. "To neglect social duties, says D.G. Ritchie, in *Natural Rights*, "in order to save one's own soul is, happily, a dwindling type of religion." History of

INNER INTEGRATION

mankind proves that sometimes the most broad-minded persons fall a prey to the prejudices associated with their religion. Of course, there are persons who rise above the bigotry of narrow religionism. Nonetheless, men are prone to estimate beliefs of others by their own notions. This presumptuous attitude creates all manner of misunderstandings, and also arrests the development of a homogeneous national outlook. In a foreword to *Fleet Street and Other Poems*, Mr. John Davidson makes the inspiring plea that "men should no longer degrade themselves under such appellations as Christian, Mohammedan, Agnostic, Monist etc. Men are the Universe become conscious, the simplest man should consider himself too great to be called after any name."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS given below have been especially helpful to my constructing the thesis on India's Socialistic Pattern of Society. There are, of course, many more books not mentioned here, that bear directly or indirectly on the subject of the present publication.

The bibliography has been arranged chapterwise, so as to enable the reader to pursue further a detailed study of the subject dealt with in any chapter.

REACTIONS AND RESPONSE

1

<i>Carnegie, Andrew</i>	— The Gospel of Wealth
<i>Ellwood, C. A.</i>	— Psychology of Human Society
<i>Gandhi, M.K.</i>	— Towards Non-Violent Socialism
<i>Gledhill, Alan</i>	— Fundamental Rights in India
<i>Hobhouse, L.T.</i>	— Elements of Social Justice
<i>Wotloon, Barbara</i>	— Freedom Under Planning

SOCIALIST SOCIETY *vs* SOCIALIST STATE

2

<i>Baldwin, Roger Nash</i>	— Liberty Under the Soviets
<i>Florinsky, M.T.</i>	— The Government of the Soviet Union
<i>Glezerman, G.</i>	— The Soviet Socialist State
<i>Hayek, F.A. von</i>	— Road to Serfdom
<i>Joad, C.E.M.</i>	— Liberty To-day
<i>Kent, T.W.</i>	— The Welfare State
<i>Laski, Harold J.</i>	— Liberty and the Modern State
<i>Lecky, W.E.H.</i>	— Democracy and Liberty
<i>Macaulay, T.B.</i>	— History of England
<i>Maxwell, Bertram W.</i>	— The Soviet State
<i>Mayo, H.B.</i>	— Democracy and Marxism
<i>Mill, John Stuart</i>	— The Principles of Political Science
<i>Paine, Thomas</i>	— Rights of Man
<i>Tawney, R.H.</i>	— Equality

PRICE OF PRIVATE PROFIT

3

<i>Alexeyev, A.</i>	— The Basic Law of Modern Capitalism
<i>Anshen, Melvin</i>	— Private Enterprise and Public Policy
<i>Berle, A.A.</i>	— Twentieth Century Capitalist Revolution
<i>Canham, Erwin D.</i>	— New Frontiers of Freedom
<i>Davenport, H.J.</i>	— The Economics of Enterprise
<i>Dobb, Maurice</i>	— Political Economy and Capitalism

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <i>Dobb, N.H.</i> | — Capitalist Enterprise and Social Progress |
| <i>Ely, Richard T.</i> | — Outlines of Economics |
| <i>Goyder, George</i> | — Future of Private Enterprise |
| <i>Hobson, J.A.</i> | — The Evolution of Modern Capitalism |
| <i>Marshall, Alfred</i> | — Principles of Economics |
| <i>Meakin, W.</i> | — The New Industrial Revolution |
| <i>Mitchell, Wesley</i> | — Business Cycles |
| <i>Pigou, A.C.</i> | — Socialism versus Capitalism |
| <i>Quinn, T.K.</i> | — Giant Business : Threat to Democracy |
| <i>Ricardo, David</i> | — Principles of Political Economy and Taxation |
| <i>Stern, Frederick Martin</i> | — Capitalism in America |
| <i>Strachey, John</i> | — The Nature of Capitalist Crisis |
| <i>Sweezy, P.M.</i> | — The Theory of Capitalist Development |
| <i>Veblen, Thorstein</i> | — The Theory of Business Enterprise |
| <i>Wilson, Thomas</i> | — Modern Capitalism and Economic Progress. |
| <i>Withers, Hartley</i> | — The Case for Capitalism |
| <i>Wright, D.M.</i> | — Capitalism |

EQUITY AND EQUALITY

4

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| <i>Beer, Max</i> | — History of British Socialism |
| <i>Bernstein, E.</i> | — Evolutionary Socialism |
| <i>Cole, G.D.H.</i> | — Guild Socialism Restated |
| " " | — Socialist Thought : The Forerunners 1789-1850 |
| <i>Dickinson, H.</i> | — Economics of Socialism |
| <i>Dobb, Maurice</i> | — On Economic Theory and Socialism |
| <i>Durbin, E.F.M.</i> | — The Politics of Democratic Socialism |
| <i>Ely, Richard T.</i> | — Socialism and Social Reform |
| <i>Engels, F.</i> | — Socialism : Utopian and Scientific |
| <i>Estey, J.A.</i> | — Revolutionary Syndicalism |
| <i>Grey, Alexander</i> | — The Socialist Tradition from Mosses to Lenin |
| <i>Heiden, K.</i> | — A History of National Socialism |
| <i>Hertzler, S.O.</i> | — History of Utopian Thought |
| <i>Humphrey, A.W.</i> | — The Modern Case for Socialism |
| <i>Kardelj, Edward</i> | — Socialist Democracy : In Yugoslav Practice |
| <i>Kirkups, T.</i> | — History of Socialism |
| <i>Laidler, Harry W.</i> | — A History of Socialist Thought |
| <i>Lange and Taylor</i> | — On the Economic Theory of Socialism |
| <i>MacDonald, J Ramsay</i> | — Socialism, Critical and Constructive |
| <i>More, Thomas</i> | — Utopia |
| <i>Morris and Bax</i> | — Socialism, its Growth and Outcome |
| <i>Owen, Robert</i> | — A New View of Society |

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

<i>Raven, C.E.</i>	— Christian Socialism
<i>Russell, Bertrand</i>	— Roads to Freedom
<i>Salisbury, Harrison</i>	— Stalin's Russia and After
<i>Shaw, George Bernard</i>	— The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Capitalism and Socialism
<i>Shaw, Webb and others</i>	— Fabian Essays on Socialism
<i>Townsend, Peter</i>	— China Phoenix : The Revolution in China
<i>Wells, H.G.</i>	— New Worlds for Old
<i>Wilson, C.</i>	— What Socialism Is

DOCTRINE OF DETERMINISM

5

<i>Boehm-Bawerk, E. von</i>	— Karl Marx and the Close of His System
<i>Boudin, L.B.</i>	— Theoretical System of Karl Marx
<i>Bukharin, N.</i>	— The A.B.C. of Communism
<i>Cole, G.D.H.</i>	— Studies in Class Structure
<i>Croce, B.</i>	— Historical Materialism and the Economics of Karl Marx
<i>Drucker, P.F.</i>	— The End of Economic Man
<i>Eastman, M.</i>	— Marx, Lenin and Revolution
<i>Fitzgerald, C.P.</i>	— The Chinese Revolution
<i>Gregg, Richard B.</i>	— Which Way Lies Hope
<i>Hecker, Julius F.</i>	— Religion & Communism
<i>Hunt, Robert N.C.</i>	— The Theory and Practice of Communism
<i>Kautsky, Karl</i>	— The Economic Doctrines of Karl Marx
<i>Laski, Harold J.</i>	— Communism
<i>Lenin, V.I.</i>	— State and Revolution
<i>Marx, Karl</i>	— The Criticism of the Gotha Programme
”	— The Capital
<i>Mashruwala, K.G.</i>	— Gandhi and Marx
<i>Monnert, Jules</i>	— Sociology of Communism
<i>Plamenatz, John</i>	— German Marxism and Russian Communism
<i>Roy, M.N.</i>	— Reason, Romanticism and Revolution
<i>Russell, Bertrand</i>	— The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism
<i>Schuman, Frederick L.</i>	— Soviet Politics
<i>Spratt, Philip</i>	— Communism and India
<i>Watson, Francis</i>	— Revolution and Communism

STAR OF SARVODAYA

6

<i>Alexander, S.</i>	— Moral Order and Progress
<i>Andrews, C.F.</i>	— Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas
<i>Barnett, Cannon</i>	— Practicable Socialism
<i>Bhave, Vinoba</i>	— Swaraj Sastra
<i>Bose, Nirmal Kumar</i>	— Studies in Gandhism
<i>Dhavan, Gopinath</i>	— The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <i>Gandhi, M.K.</i> | — My Experiments With Truth |
| " " | — Sarvodaya |
| <i>Holmes, John Haynes</i> | — My Gandhi |
| <i>Mashruwala, K.G.</i> | — Practical Non-violence |
| <i>Mohan, Dharendra</i> | — The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi |
| <i>Muste, A.J.</i> | — Non-violence is an Aggressive World |
| <i>Rolland, Romain</i> | — Mahatma Gandhi |

FRATERNITY OF FREE MEN

7

- | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <i>Adler, F.</i> | — An Ethical Philosophy of Life |
| <i>Coit, Stanton</i> | — The Message of Man |
| <i>Davenport, Russell W.</i> | — The Dignity of Man |
| <i>Gandhi, M.K.</i> | — Constructive Programme |
| <i>Goldsmith, Joel S.</i> | — Living the Infinite Way |
| <i>Hobhouse, L.T.</i> | — Morals in Evolution |
| <i>Huxley, T.H.</i> | — Evolution and Ethics |
| <i>Tolstoy, Count Leo</i> | — What Shall We Do? |

STATELESS SOCIETY

8

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| <i>Bosanquet, Bernard</i> | — The Philosophical Theory of the State |
| <i>Brogan, D.W.</i> | — The Free State |
| <i>Creedy, F.</i> | — The Next Step in Civilization |
| <i>Green, T.H.</i> | — Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation |
| <i>Hobhouse, L.T.</i> | — The Metaphysical Theory of the State |
| <i>Kohn, Hans</i> | — Revolutions and Dictatorship |
| <i>Locke, John</i> | — Treatise on Government |
| <i>Maciver, R.M.</i> | — The Modern State |
| <i>Masaryk, T.G.</i> | — The Making of a State |
| <i>Smith, Bruce</i> | — Liberty and Liberalism |
| <i>Speeches of Vinoba</i> | — The Voice of Vinoba |

THE PURPOSE OF PLANNING

9

- | | |
|------------------------------|--|
| <i>Angell, Norman</i> | — From Chaos to Control |
| <i>Baldwin, C.D.</i> | — Economic Planning: Its Aims and Implications |
| <i>Cole, G.D.H.</i> | — Principles of Economic Planning |
| <i>Das, Nabagopal</i> | — Industrial Planning: Why and How |
| <i>Harris, Seymour E.</i> | — Economic Planning |
| <i>Hayek, F.A. von</i> | — Individualism and the Economic Order |
| <i>Kumarappa, J.C.</i> | — Planning for the People by the People |
| <i>Lalwani, Kastur Chand</i> | — Economic Planning |
| <i>Landaver, C.</i> | — Theory of National Economic Planning |

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| <i>Laski, Harold J.</i> | — Plan or Perish |
| <i>Lauterbach, A.T.</i> | — Economic Security and Individual Freedom: Can We Have Both? |
| <i>Lipson, E.</i> | — A Planned Economy or Free Enterprise |
| <i>Shah, K.T.</i> | — National Planning, Principles and Administration |
| <i>Wootton, Barbara</i> | — Plan or No Plan |
| <i>Zweig, Ferdynand</i> | — The Planning of Free Societies |

THE PROBLEM OF PRIORITIES

10

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Agarwal, S.N.</i> | — The Gandhian Plan |
| <i>Balakrishna, R.</i> | — Regional Planning in India |
| <i>Banerjee, Parikh and Tarkunde</i> | — People's Plan for Economic Development of India |
| <i>Durbin, E.F.M.</i> | — Problems of Economic Planning |
| <i>Gadgil, D.R.</i> | — Economic Policy and Development |
| <i>Giri, Raghuvir</i> | — Some Problems of National Planning |
| <i>Mises, Ludwig von</i> | — Theory of Money and Credit |
| <i>Nag, D.S.</i> | — A Study of Economic Plans for India |
| <i>Nurkse, R.</i> | — Problems of Capital Formation in Under-developed Countries |
| <i>Pant, Y.P.</i> | — Planning in Under-developed Countries |
| <i>Rao, V.K.R.V.</i> | — Deficit Financing, Capital Formation and Price Behaviour in an Under-developed Economy |
| <i>Singh, Baljit</i> | — Economic Planning in India |

HOPE FOR HUMANITY

11

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| <i>Josh and Dheknev</i> | — Irrigation and Agriculture in the First Five-Year Plan |
| <i>Mashhruwala, K.G.</i> | — A Vision of Future India |
| <i>Parikh, Chandulal P.</i> | — Towards Doubling National Income |
| <i>Planning Commission</i> | — Draft Outline of the Second Five-Year Plan |

EQUILIBRIUM IN ECONOMICS

12

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <i>Fogarty, M.P.</i> | — Economic Control |
| <i>Haney, L.H.</i> | — History of Economic Thought |
| <i>Lerner, A.P.</i> | — Economics of Control |
| <i>Lewinski, Jan St.</i> | — The Founders of Political Economy |
| <i>List, Friedrich</i> | — The National System of Political Economy |
| <i>Lloyd, E.M.H.</i> | — Experiments in State Control |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <i>Masani, M.R.</i> | — A Plea for the Mixed Economy |
| <i>M'Culloch, J.R.</i> | — Principles of Political Economy |
| <i>Monroe, A.E.</i> | — Early Economic Thought |
| <i>Reford, Emmette S.</i> | — Administration of National Economic Control |
| <i>Sismondi, Leonard de</i> | — New Principles of Political Economy |
| <i>Smith, Adam</i> | — The Wealth of Nations |
| <i>Soule, George</i> | — Ideas of the Great Economists |
| <i>Taussig, F.W.</i> | — Principles of Economics |
| <i>Wicksteed, P.H.</i> | — The Commonsense of Political Economy |
| <i>Zeuthen, F.</i> | — Economic Theory and Method |

FEARS WITHOUT FACTS

13

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <i>Agarwala, A.N.</i> | — Pessimism in Planning |
| <i>Bajpai, R.G.</i> | — A Few Aspects of the Indian Economy |
| <i>Buchanan, D.H.</i> | — The Development of Capitalist Enterprise in India |
| <i>Kaplan, A.D.</i> | — Big Enterprise in Competitive System |
| <i>Keynes, John Maynard</i> | — General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money |
| <i>Opdyke, G.</i> | — A Treatise on Political Economy |
| <i>Sharma, S.L.</i> | — Some Trends of Capitalist Concentration in India |
| <i>Stocking and Watkins</i> | — Monopoly and Free Enterprise |
| <i>Suranji-unger, Theo</i> | — Private Enterprise and Governmental Control |

SETTING NEW STANDARDS

14

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <i>Agarwala, A.N.</i> | — Public Corporations |
| <i>Bienstock and others</i> | — Management in Russian Industry and Agriculture |
| <i>Burton, E.R.</i> | — Employee Representation |
| <i>Cole, G.D.H.</i> | — Self-Government in Industry |
| <i>Das, Nabagopal</i> | — The Public Sector |
| <i>Davis, R.C.</i> | — Industrial Organisation and Management |
| <i>Dimock, Marshall E.</i> | — British Public Utilities and National Development |
| <i>Dutt, D.K.</i> | — Industrial Management in India |
| <i>Einaudi, M.</i> | — Nationalisation in France and Italy |
| <i>Franick, David</i> | — Management of the Industrial Firm in the USSR |
| <i>Gerstenberg, C.W.</i> | — Financial Organisation and Management of Business |

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <i>Jones, Edward D.</i> | — The Administration of Industrial Enterprises |
| <i>Robson, William A.</i> | — Public Enterprise |
| <i>Stalin, J.V.</i> | — Problems of Nationalised Industries |
| <i>Taylor, F.W.</i> | — The Tasks of Business Executives |
| <i>Trundle, George T.</i> | — Scientific Management |
| <i>Wilson, Herring and Eustler</i> | — Managerial Control of Business |
| | — Public Utility Industries |

DEMOLITION OF DOGMA

15

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| <i>Addison, C.</i> | — Practical Socialism |
| <i>Baldwin, George B.</i> | — Beyond Nationalisation |
| <i>Coller, F.H.</i> | — A State Trading Adventure |
| <i>Davies, Ernest</i> | — National Enterprise |
| <i>Gadgil, D.R.</i> | — Economic Policy and Development |
| <i>Gloag, John</i> | — What About Enterprise |
| <i>Lewis, Ben W.</i> | — British Planning and Nationalisation |
| <i>Money, Leo Chiozza</i> | — The Triumph of Nationalisation |
| <i>Robison, W.A.</i> | — Problems of Nationalised Industries |
| <i>Williams, Francis</i> | — Magnificent Journey |

DEMOCRACY BEATS DICTATORSHIP

16

- | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Lewis, Sinclair</i> | — It Can't Happen There |
| <i>Lippman, Walter</i> | — The Public Philosophy |
| <i>Mann, Thomas</i> | — Coming Victory of Democracy |
| <i>Pearson, Lester B.</i> | — Democracy in World Politics |
| <i>Roche and Stedman</i> | — Dynamics of Democratic Government |
| <i>Trotsky, Leon</i> | — Dictatorship vs Democracy |

INDIA AFTER INDEPENDENCE

17

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Gopal, M.H.</i> | — Indian Economy Since Independence |
| <i>Guha, Sunil</i> | — The Eighth Year of Freedom |
| <i>Hartog, Lady</i> | — India : New Pattern |

COMPARISON WITHOUT CRITICISM

18

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| <i>Basily, N. de</i> | — Russia Under Soviet Rule |
| <i>Batsell, Walter R.</i> | — Soviet Rule in Russia |
| <i>Butler, N. M.</i> | — True and False Democracy |
| <i>Cameron, James</i> | — Mandarin Red—A Journey Behind the Bamboo Curtain |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <i>Condliffe, J.B.</i> | — China To-day, Economic |
| <i>Dobb, Maurice</i> | — Russian Economic Development Since the Revolution |
| <i>Ganguli, B.N.</i> | — Economic Development in New China |
| <i>Gupta, D.D.</i> | — With Nehru in China |
| <i>Hsia, R.</i> | — Economic Planning in Communist China |
| <i>Jain, Jagdish Chandra</i> | — Amidst The Chinese People |
| <i>Lyons, E.</i> | — Our Secret Allies : The Peoples of Russia |
| <i>Monroe, P.</i> | — China : A Nation in Evolution |
| <i>Mukherjee, S.</i> | — A Visit to New China |
| <i>Panikar, K.M.</i> | — In Two Chinas—Memoirs of a Diplomat |
| <i>Salisbury, Harrison E.</i> | — American in Russia |
| <i>Stevens, Leslie C.</i> | — Life in China |
| <i>Walker, Richard L.</i> | — China Under Communism |

DANGER TO DEMOCRACY

19

- | | |
|---------------------------|--|
| <i>Beveridge, W.H.</i> | — Full Employment in a Free Society |
| " " " | — Unemployment, A Problem of Industry |
| <i>Casselman, P.H.</i> | — Economics of Employment and Unemployment |
| <i>Cole, G.D.H.</i> | — Beveridge Explained |
| <i>Commons and others</i> | — Can Business Prevent Employment? |
| <i>Das, Nabagopal</i> | — Unemployment, Full Employment and India |
| <i>Desai, Ramesh N.</i> | — Employment and Planning |
| <i>Feldman, H.</i> | — The Regularization of Employment |
| <i>Gupta, Brij Gopal</i> | — A Treatise on Unemployment |
| <i>Learner, A. P.</i> | — Economics of Employment |
| <i>Pigou, A.C.</i> | — Unemployment |
| <i>Russell, Bertrand</i> | — Principles of Social Reconstruction |

FIGURES THAT FRIGHTEN

20

- | | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Astor, J.J.</i> | — Is Unemployment Inevitable? |
| <i>Das, Nabagopal</i> | — Men Without Work |
| <i>East, E.M.</i> | — Mankind at the Crossroads |
| <i>Hobson, J.A.</i> | — The Economics of Unemployment |
| <i>Nair, U.S.</i> | — Census of 1951 : Sampling Studies |
| <i>Reuter, E.B.</i> | — Population Problems |

PRODUCTION BY THE PEOPLE

21

- | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| <i>Agarwala, A.N.</i> | — Industrial Problems of India |
| <i>Cole, G.D.H.</i> | — Socialist Economics |

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

<i>Das, Nabagopal</i>	— Industrial Enterprise in India
<i>Datta, B.</i>	— Economics of Industrialisation
<i>Dey, Sushil</i>	— Industrial Development—A New Approach
<i>Dobb, Maurice</i>	— Some Aspects of Economic Development
<i>Drucker, Peter</i>	— The Future of Industrial Man
<i>Filene, E.G.</i>	— The Way Out
<i>Ghosh and Prakash</i>	— Principles and Problems of Industrial Organisation
<i>Juenger, F.G.</i>	— The Failure of Technology
<i>Lokanathan, P.S.</i>	— Industrial Organisation in India
<i>MacGregor, D.H.</i>	— Rationalization of Industry
<i>Mayo, Elton</i>	— The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization
<i>Mehta, Vaikunth L.</i>	— Why Decentralisation
<i>Owen, Robert</i>	— Observations on the Effects of the Manufacturing System
<i>Patterson, S. Howard</i>	— Social Aspects of Industry
<i>Polokov, Walter N.</i>	— The Power Age
<i>Priestly and Jacquetta</i>	— Journey Down a Rainbow
<i>Schumpeter, Jos.</i>	— The Theory of Economic Development
<i>Steindl, Joseph</i>	— Small and Big Business
<i>Strehl, Rolf</i>	— The Robots Are Among U.S.

LIVE AND LET LIVE

22

<i>All-India Handicrafts Board</i>	— Handicrafts of India
"	— The Story of Handicrafts
<i>Gandhi, M.K.</i>	— Economics of Khadi
"	— The Economics of Village Industries
<i>Gregg, Richard B.</i>	— Economics of Khaddar

LAND FOR THE LANDLESS

23

<i>Coulanges, N.D.F. de</i>	— The Origin of Property in Land
<i>Davies, C.E.</i>	— Agricultural Holdings and Tenant Right
<i>Denman, D.R.</i>	— Tenant-Right Valuation in History and Modern Thought
<i>Ely and Wehrwein</i>	— Land Economics
<i>Field, C.D.</i>	— Landholding and the Relation of Landlord and Tenant in Various Countries
<i>Jackson, T.C.</i>	— Agricultural Holdings
<i>Jacoby, E.H.</i>	— Inter-Relationship between Agrarian Reform and Agricultural Development
<i>Lefevre, G. Shaw</i>	— Agrarian Tenures

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <i>Malaviya, H.D.</i> | — Land Reforms in India |
| <i>Mookerjee, Radha Kumud</i> | — Land Reforms in India |
| <i>Nehru, Jawaharlal</i> | — Glimpses of World History |
| <i>Planning Commission</i> | — Progress of Land Reforms |
| <i>Sen, Bhowani</i> | — Indian Land System and Land Reforms |
| <i>Singh, Baljit</i> | — Wither Agriculture in India |
| <i>Spiegel, H.W.</i> | — Land Tenure Policies at Home and Abroad |
| <i>Woodfall, W.</i> | — Landlord and Tenant |

COLLECTIVIZATION FACES CRISIS

24

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| <i>App, Frank</i> | — Farm Economics, Management and Distribution |
| <i>Ashby, A.W.</i> | — Allotments and Small Holdings |
| <i>Chew, A.P.</i> | — Science Serving Agriculture |
| <i>Hayek, F.A. von</i> | — Collectivist Economic Planning |
| <i>Holmes, C.L.</i> | — Economics of Farm Organisation and Management |
| <i>Hoover, C.B.</i> | — The Economic Life of Soviet Russia |
| <i>Howe, Frank William</i> | — Farm Economics |
| <i>Hubbard, L.</i> | — The Economics of Soviet Agriculture |
| <i>Jebb, L.</i> | — Small Holdings |
| <i>Lalwani, K.C.</i> | — Agriculture Economics |
| <i>Massingham, E.</i> | — The Small Farmer |
| <i>Maynard, John</i> | — The Russian Peasant and other Studies |
| <i>Rogin, Leo</i> | — The Introduction of Farm Machinery in its Relation to the Productivity of Labour |
| <i>Spillman, W.J.</i> | — Farm Management |
| <i>Webb, Sidney and Beatrice</i> | — Soviet Communism : A New Civilization |

RURAL REJUVENATION

25

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| <i>Binns, B.O.</i> | — Agricultural Credit for Small Farmers |
| <i>Carver, T.N.</i> | — Principles of Rural Economics |
| <i>Murray, W.G.</i> | — Agricultural Finance |
| <i>Nourse, E.G.</i> | — Agricultural Economics |
| <i>Rew, R.H.</i> | — A Primer of Agriculture Economics |
| <i>Taylor, H.C.</i> | — Outlines of Agricultural Economics |
| <i>Venn, J.A.</i> | — The Foundations of Agricultural Economics |
| <i>Warriner, Doreen</i> | — Economics of Peasant Farming |

THE PRINCE OF PEACE

26

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
| <i>Deshpande and Desai</i> | — | Vinoba Ke Sath |
| <i>Rambhai, Suresh</i> | — | Vinoba and His Mission |
| <i>Tennyson, Hallam</i> | — | Saint on the March |

REAL REVOLUTION

27

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
| <i>Bhave, Vinoba</i> | — | Bhoodan Yajna |
| " " | — | Gaon Gaon Men Swarajya |
| <i>Majumdar, Dhirendra</i> | — | Gram Raj |
| <i>Patwardhan, A.S.</i> | — | Gaon Ka Gokul |

ETHICAL VIEW OF ECONOMICS

28

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| <i>Laird, John</i> | — | A Study in Moral Theory |
| <i>More, Thomas</i> | — | Utopia II |
| <i>Narain, Jai Prakash</i> | — | Jeevandan |
| <i>Ruskin, John</i> | — | Unto This Last |

BUILDING FROM BELOW

29

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <i>Allen, H.B.</i> | — | Rural Reconstruction in Action |
| <i>Gandhi, M.K.</i> | — | Rebuilding Our Villages |
| <i>Green, Helen D.</i> | — | Social Work Practice in Community Organisation |
| <i>Kelsey and Hearne</i> | — | Co-operative Extension Work |
| <i>Randhawa, M.S.</i> | — | National Extension Services and Community Projects in Punjab |
| <i>Stroup, Herbert Hewett</i> | — | Community Welfare Organisation |
| <i>Taleyarkhan, Homi J.</i> | — | Community Projects in India |

DISPERSAL OF DEMOCRACY

30

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| <i>Becker, Carl L.</i> | — | Modern Democracy |
| <i>Benes, Edward</i> | — | Democracy To-day and Tomorrow |
| <i>Bergson, Henri</i> | — | Creative Evolution |
| <i>Burns, C.D.</i> | — | Democracy |
| <i>Dube, S.C.</i> | — | Indian Village |
| <i>Griffiths, Percival</i> | — | The British Impact on India |
| <i>Khanna, R.L.</i> | — | Panchayat Raj in India |
| <i>Lecky, W.E.H.</i> | — | Democracy and Liberty |
| <i>Lindsay, A.D.</i> | — | Essentials of Democracy |
| <i>Marriot, M.</i> | — | Village India : Studies in Little Community |
| <i>Nehru, Jawaharlal</i> | — | Glimpses of World History |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Rao, A.V. Raman* — Structure and Working of Village Panchayats

PARTNERSHIP ENSURES PROSPERITY

31

- Ansell, C.* — A Treatise on Friendly Societies
Atkinson, H. — Co-operative Production
Bagai, Krishan Dev — Co-operative Movement in India
Bakken, Henry H. — Economics of Co-operative Marketing
Barnes, A. — The Political Aspect of Co-operation
Enfield, A.H. — Co-operation
Fay, C.R. — Co-operation at Home and Abroad
Gardner, Chastina — Co-operation in Agriculture
Kulkarni, K.R. — Theory and Practice of Co-operation in India and Abroad
Lal, Champa — Industrial and Construction Co-operatives
Warbasse, J.P. — Co-operative Democracy
Wilkinson, J.F. — Friendly Society Movement
Woolf, L.S. — Co-operation and the Future of Industry

OBLIGATIONS OF OFFICE

32

- Appleby, Paul* — Report on Public Administration in India
Dale, Harold E. — Personnel and Problems of the Higher Civil Services
Finer, Herman — British Civil Service
Kingsley, J. Donald — Representative Bureaucracy
Leffingwell, W.H. — Office Management, Principles and Practice
Majumdar, B.B. — Problems of Public Administration in India
Meriam, Lewis — Public Service and Special Training
Mosher and Kingsley — Public Personnel Administration
O'Malley, L.S.S. — The Indian Civil Service
White, Leonard D. — Civil Service in the Modern State

MANUFACTURING MISFITS

33

- Adams, J.* — The New Teaching
Armstrong, S.C. — Education for Life
Bode, B.H. — Fundamentals of Education
Bolton, F.E. — Principles of Education
Dewey, John — Democracy and Education
Egerton, F.C.S. — The Future of Education
Findlay, J.J. — The Foundations of Education
Gentile, G. — The Reform of Education
Hall, G.S. — Educational Problems

INDIA'S SOCIALISTIC PATTERN OF SOCIETY

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <i>Hartog, P.J.</i> | — Examinations and Their Relations to Culture and Efficiency |
| <i>Kaul, G.N.</i> | — The New Basis of Indian Educational Thought |
| <i>Livingstone, R.W.</i> | — The Future in Education |
| <i>Russell, Bertrand</i> | — Education and the Social Order |
| <i>Sandiford, P.</i> | — Comparative Education |

LEARNING FOR LIFE

34

- | | |
|----------------------------|--|
| <i>Adams, J.</i> | — Modern Developments in Educational Practice |
| <i>Bode, B.H.</i> | — Modern Educational Theories |
| <i>Campbell, A.E.</i> | — Modern Trends in Education |
| <i>Cook, H.C.</i> | — The Play Way |
| <i>Dewey, John</i> | — Interest and Effort in Education |
| <i>Freeman, F.N.</i> | — Experimental Education |
| <i>Gandhi, M.K.</i> | — Towards New Education |
| <i>Hartman, Gertrude</i> | — The Child and His School |
| <i>Huxley, T.H.</i> | — Technical Education |
| <i>Jacks, M.J.</i> | — The Education of Good Men |
| <i>Kabir, Humayun</i> | — A Programme of National Education for India |
| <i>Kandel, I.L.</i> | — The New Era in Education |
| <i>Lynch, A.J.</i> | — Individual Work and the Dalton Plan |
| <i>MacMunn, N.</i> | — The Child's Path to Freedom |
| <i>Majumdar, Dharendra</i> | — Nai Taleem |
| <i>Patel, M.S.</i> | — The Educational Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi |
| <i>Parkhurst, H.</i> | — Education on the Dalton Plan |
| <i>Stevenson, J.A.</i> | — The Project Method of Teaching |
| <i>Stormzand, W.J.</i> | — Progressive Methods of Teaching |
| <i>Wynne, J.B.</i> | — Principles of Educational Method |

DEMOCRACY DEMANDS DISCIPLINE

35

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <i>Bain, A.W.</i> | — The Modern Teacher |
| <i>Baldwin, S.E.</i> | — The Relations of Education to Citizenship |
| <i>Craddock, E.A.</i> | — The Class-room Republic |
| <i>Dewey, John</i> | — School and Society |
| <i>Fox-Pitt, St. G.</i> | — The Purpose of Education |
| <i>Gandhi, M.K.</i> | — To the Students |
| <i>Hennesy, Josselyn</i> | — India, Democracy and Education |
| <i>Kilpatrik, Wm. H.</i> | — Education for a Changing Civilization |
| <i>Russell, Bertrand</i> | — Education and the Good Life |

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Weigle, L.A. — The Pupil and the Teacher

INNER INTEGRATION

36

- | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Bhattacharya, J.N.</i> | — Hindu Castes and Sects |
| <i>Bose, S.C.</i> | — The Hindus as They Are |
| <i>Caird, E.</i> | — The Evolution of Religion |
| <i>Das, Bhagwan</i> | — Essential Unity of all Religions |
| <i>Dickinson, G. Lowes</i> | — Religion |
| <i>Farquhar, J.N.</i> | — The Crown of Hinduism |
| <i>Gandhi, M.K.</i> | — Communal Unity |
| „ „ „ | — Hindu Dharma |
| „ „ „ | — Untouchability |
| „ „ „ | — My Religion |
| <i>Hopkins, E.W.</i> | — The Ethics of India |
| <i>Mitchell, J. Murray</i> | — Hinduism Past and Present |
| <i>Morgan, Kenneth W.</i> | — The Basic Beliefs of Hinduism |
| <i>Oman, J.C.</i> | — Indian Life, Religious and Social |
| <i>Rajagopalachari, C.</i> | — Hinduism |
| <i>Santhanam, K.</i> | — The Fight Against Untouchability |
| <i>Wilkins, W.J.</i> | — Modern Hinduism |

REVIEWS AND OPINIONS

1. TEACHINGS OF MAHATMA GANDHI

"The book will prove of immense help to any serious student of Gandhian philosophy as a book of reference. Mr. Jag Parvesh Chandra has devoted much time and labour and I hope his labours will be appreciated by the public."

—Foreword by Dr. Rajendra Prasad.

2. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU AND HIS IDEAS

"The book helps you to understand the dynamic personality of Nehru."

—The Leader.

3. INDIA STEPS FORWARD—(The Story of the Cabinet Mission in words and pictures)

"Your book is most interesting."

—Lord Pethick Lawrence.

4. THE CONGRESS CASE (A reply to Government of India's book "Congress Responsibility for Disturbances")

"The author in a concise form has stated not merely the Congress case but has also exposed the fallacy of the British claim that Gandhiji was pro-Japanese."

—Foreword by K.M. Munshi.

"The author has done better than most of the people in his work. I may part company from him in a few places, but he has done well on the whole."

—C. Rajagopalachari.

5. I IMPEACH BEVERLY NICHOLS—(A reply to "Verdict on India")

"The rebuttal of Mr. Nichols's thesis and arguments are not only clear and forceful but present a wealth of facts with a rich humour."

—The Hindu.

6. GANDHI AGAINST FASCISM—(A reply to British Government's charge that Gandhiji was pro-Fascist)

"You have done great service to the nation and to a great extent cleared my position."

—M.K. Gandhi.

7. THE UNSEEN POWER

"The book should adorn every library in India, for it is the Bible of present-day Indian thought."

—The Sind Observer.

8. TAGORE AND GANDHI ARGUE

"The author has put forth before the readers the spontaneous understanding of these two great sons of India."

—The Hindustan Review.

9. MEET THE HEROES—(Life, Personality and Work of I.N.A. Heroes: Shah Nawas, Seghal and Dhillon)

"The snapshots are lively....the snippets are memorable."

—The Hindustan Times.

10. GITA THE MOTHER

"Mr. Jag Parvesh has performed a labour of love and rendered notable service to the cultured public."

—Ceylon Daily News.

11. THE GOOD LIFE

"A careful perusal of this book will revolutionise one's basic values of life."

—The Tribune.

12. POLITICAL DELHI: ITS WIT AND HUMOUR

"The book is full of humour....its perusal makes one understand the currents and cross-currents that run under the political life of India's capital."

—The Hindustan Standard.

13. MEET COL. LAKSHMI

"This is a small book more entertaining than reading a short story."

—The Hindustan Times.

14. ETHICS OF FASTING

"The volume deserves to be read by all students of Gandhian philosophy."

—Amrita Bazar Patrika.

15. IS GROUPING OF PROVINCES COMPULSORY?

"The author has solved a controversial issue in a simple, straight forward manner."

—The Pioneer.

16. THE PENSIVE MOOD—(A collection of poems)

"These poems symbolise the conflict between the inner urges of the young poet and the realities of life."

—The Assam Tribune.